



VAJASANEYI PRATISAKHYA

Part I

Text
with
Translation & Critical Notes

by
S. N. GHOSAL

With the English Translation of A. Weber's Introduction to the Text

INDIAN
STUDIES
PAST & PRESENT

**V A J A S A N E Y I
P R A T I S A K H Y A**

Part I

**Text
with
English Translation and Critical Notes
by
S. N. GHOSAL**

With the English Translation of A. Weber's Introduction to the Text

**INDIAN
STUDIES
PAST & PRESENT**

Printed by Ashitabha Guha from
Quality Printers & Binders, 84
Rashbehari Avenue, Calcutta-26,
and Published by R. K. Maitra
on behalf of *Indian Studies : Past
& Present*, 3 Sambhunath Pundit
Street, Calcutta-20

Rs. 6.00

Publication Date of this Reprint
15th March, 1964

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

CONTENTS

Translator's Preface	1
Weber's Introduction to VP	3
<i>ṽājasaneyi Prātiśākhya</i>	
Chapter I	17
Chapter II	55

The Vajasaneyi - Pratisakhya

Translated by S. N. GHOSAL

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

While preparing the English translation of the *Vājasaneyi-prātiśākhya* it came to our view that the text, which Weber prepared, differed occasionally from the text of the Madras University edition, that was worked out by V. V. Sharma. Though the differences between the two texts were not perplexing and of a revolutionary nature, we did not consider either of them absolutely dependable. Hence we felt the urge for preparing our own text, which was evidently based on the editions of Weber and Sharma, the commentaries of Uvaṭa and Ananta-bhaṭṭa and also the variants provided by Weber in his explanatory notes and comments. So this edition has got certain limitations, as it is not based on the first hand investigation of the manuscripts. But this does not stand as an insurmountable obstacle to the settlement of the text. Because, as we have stated just now, the differences between the two texts were not wide. Nor was there much scope for them, as, according to the practice, all possible care was being taken from times immemorial for the maintenance of the sanctity of the Vedic texts and the preservation of the purity of their words. Under these circumstances though provided with scanty materials, as in the present case, it is possible for one to present an approximately correct text. So the text, which we produce here, may be assumed to approach close to the author's original.

We must unequivocally admit here that in preparing the English translation of the *Vāj.-pr.* we took immense help from the two commentaries, namely those of Uvaṭa and Ananta-bhaṭṭa, without which it would not have been possible for us to perform our task. We fully utilised also the German translation of Weber, with whom we could not agree in many places. We have occasionally added notes to our translations and much of these were gathered by us from the comments which Weber had given in support of his translation. We have, on many occasions, supported the statements of the work with extracts from other Prātiśākhyas—particularly the *Ṛk-* and the *Taittirīya-prātiśākhyas*. So far as the extracts from the *Ath.-pr.* are concerned, these were collected by us from the commentary of Weber. Sometimes we have quoted the statements of Weber, his observations and studies, which are in German original. These have been simultaneously translated into English for making the same accessible to the English-knowing scholars.

Here we must advance some explanation for the inclusion of Weber's introduction into our edition, which one should not ordinarily do. This has been done due to the consideration of the incalculable importance of the introduction which has given rise to a great controversy among the scholars. It embodies Weber's arguments in support of

the view that the *Vāj.-pr.* is prior to Pāṇini, which, though accepted by a large number of scholars, has been vehemently contradicted by a still greater number of them. The latter with equal emphasis assert that the conclusion should be otherwise, i. e. Pāṇini is prior to the *Vāj.-pr.*, which might follow even from the arguments that Weber has marshalled in support of his theory. A study of these arguments, it is needless to mention, enables one to make a proper estimate not only of Weber's viewpoint but also of the counter-arguments of his adversaries, who have made vigorous attempts to demolish his proposition.

In the review, which we have given as an appendix to Weber's introduction, we have discussed some of the arguments of Weber's opponents. We have shown that the arguments of the contending parties do not possess convincing evidence, which might decide the issue in favour of either. The problem remains still an open one in spite of scholars' attempts to come to definite conclusion. It should be stated here that with this problem there remains inseparably connected another problem of no mean importance, which is whether the author of the *Vāj.-pr.* is to be considered identical with the author of the *Vārttikasūtras*. Here, too, indecision prevails and the successful settlement of the former can alone lead to its definite solution that would follow automatically as a corollary.

We have admitted before that we have utilised the printed editions of Weber and Sharma. Weber's edition was published in 1858 and its revision in the light of later researches has been long overdue.

We are highly grateful to the Registrar of the Madras University, who kindly granted us the permission to utilise the Madras University edition. We shall think our labours amply rewarded if we have been successful in presenting to the English-knowing scholars the true spirit of the *Prātiśākhya*, which is for the first time rendered into English and waited long for the task.

S. N. GHOSAL

An Introduction to the Vajasaneyi-Pratisakhya

A. WEBER

Translated from original German By S. N. Ghosal

The *Kātyāyaniya Prātiśākhya*—as the title appears in the post-scripts of the individual chapters in A (Chambers 35)—leads one to Kātyāyana, who is mentioned in the concluding words of the 8th *Adhyāya* (VIII. 64 *ityāha svarasaṃskāra-pratiṣṭhāpaitā bhagavān kātyāyanaḥ*). Even if the same and also the entire 8th *Adhyāya* be later additions there is no occasion for doubting the accuracy of the same. Thus the work belongs to the school of Kata, Kātya, Kātyāyana—which becomes worthy of it from its relation with the white *Yajurveda* and which, as the compound *Kurukātās* shows, seems to have stood in special connection with the stem of the Kurus ; consequently it belongs to the eastern India or the schools—which Pāṇini (himself coming from the North West) mentions as the Prāñcas. If further in a passage of the commentary to the *Śrautasūtra* of Gobhila, quoted by Roth in *Lit. u. G. des Weda* at page 56 an extract from our work is described as *Mādhyandina-śākhiya prātiśākhya*, the statement, though suitable as a general assertion, should not be considered as unconditionally correct, as it appears from the following.

It is self-evident that a definite *Samhitā* (I. 1) has stood as the subject for discussion to our work ; and the same is divided into *Adhyāyas* and *Anuvākas* according to III. 124 and IV. 166 exactly like the present *Vājas. Samhitā*, in which the otherwise mentioned divisions *an-agnau* IV. 67, *a-sautrāmanyām* III. 124, IV. 66, *an-aśvamedhe* V. 36 appear or the rules, cited for them, are observed. Since the entire mass of examples, cited in the *Pr.*, occurs verbatim in the *Vājasaneyi-samhitā* that remains before us, there is not a bit of doubt that it is the *Samhitā* for which the *Pr.* was written : again the examples, which the latter possesses, are collected not only from the *Mādhyandina*-school but also from the Kāṇva recension (Comp. III. 80, IV. 79). It is very striking in the first place that the order, in which they (i.e. the examples) are cited, very rarely and in a very general way corresponds to the order of the *Adhyāya*, from which they are taken : they appear as a rule in a confused manner (cf. e.g. in III, 80, examples from 8, 9. 3, 2. 52. 17, 37., 13, 25. 4, 10. 30, 22, 19, 29. 15, 15. 24, 4. 15, 27. 44 4, 19. 1. 24, 36 18, 80. 23, 27. 18, 13. 19, 48. 8, 12. 17, 81. 84. 25, 41) : partly here it is evident that an attempt has been made to collect the similar forms from the different *Adhyāyas* and put them side by side ; now, on the whole, this explanation is not adequate and there prevails a real disorder, which in fact I consider to be a drawback of the author—provided they cannot be explained otherwise. It is possible to conjecture that to the author of the text the *Vājas. Samhitā* was already divided into *Adhyāyas* and *anuvākas* or it treated on the whole the same subject (*agni, sautrāmaṇi, aśvamedha*)—nay in the same manner

but in a form different from that in which it has remained in the present occasion. It is supported on the one hand by the fact that, as contrary to the latter, he is responsible for many omissions (cf. e.g. II, 60.43. III, 31.80.128. V, 41. VI, 95), which are partly not of mean significance ¹—on the other by the condition, which is by far more important, that it mentions a large number of words which do not occur in the present text of the *Vāj. S.* Indeed these are the following cases.

According to I, 166 the *Samhitā* text, which remained before the author, must have contained the verse *yo naḥ svo araṇo* ; similarly according to II, 15 there are cases, where *manye* was used parenthetically ; in the same manner according to II, 19 there is a vocative *apām napāt*, in which *apām* retains its accent ; in the passages *Vāj. S.* 5,11. 19,62. 37,12 according to II, 30 *dakṣiṇā* and not *dakṣiṇatā* has been the reading :—from II, 40.60 (see the note there) it follows that the same possessed a division of the *Kaṇḍikā* which is different from that of the present time :—according to II, 55 the same contains *devatā-dvandva*, of which the first member was Soma, the second *Pūṣan*, Agni or *Vāyu* ; according to III, 42 the word is *dūṇāśa* ; according to III, 96 the word is *śacīvaso* ; according to III, 149 the words are *pravidvān agnīnā* ; according to IV, 26 the word-combinations are *viśvā amīvāḥ* and *viśvā hi mayāḥ* :—according to IV, 164 the word is *mukhya* ; according to IV, 7 the words are those in which *kh*, *p* or *ph* follow *sam* ; according to IV, 8 the instances are as *kā s kām* ; according to V, 3 the word is *ratnadhātama* ; according to V, 41 the word is *viṣṭara* or the form *viṣṭapaḥ* ; according to VI, 20-22 the construction is one of accented verb after *vā*, *āha* or *eva*.

Among these cases there are of course, a few, specially III, 46. IV, 7.8. VI, 20-22, with respect to which the conjecture remains that their mention occurs incidentally, probably for the sake of completeness, like many other rules—partly unrelated and partly entirely superfluous—which are found here in our work. It is a situation, which did not escape the notice of the commentator but gave him an occasion for making attempts at explanation—which points to such a condition that the rule concerned, which is properly superfluous, is tolerated thankfully in the same manner as one going to pluck flowers brings fruits or going to gather fuel brings honey or going to fetch water brings a fish as well (cf. III, 57) : the attempts at explanation may indicate also that the repetition concerned takes place *mandadhī-pratipattiyartham* i. e. to help them who are equipped with weak power of comprehension. In most cases we are surely compelled to acknowledge the statements and observations, which are partly relevant and partly redundant, as products of inefficiency of the author and a mark of his incapability of handling his subject properly and it is all the more so as we are able to point out multifarious

1. As for example the word *duhunā* is neither explained nor mentioned as *anavagraha* ; likewise *saviṣak* for *saviṣat* 10,2, *Kāva*, *padbhiḥ* for *padbhiḥ* 23,13 *padviśam* 25,37 *avabhāri* for *avabhāti* 6,3 *dūram* 35,19 for *dūtam*, *Kāva*, not mentioned ; certainly these words have not been specially treated in the *Padapāṭha*, which they ought to have been done. Many other peculiarities of our *Kāva* text have not been taken into consideration, e.g. the lengthening of *am* before the beginning sibilants (popular in the *Jaṭāpāṭha*), the manifold preservation of the gutturals instead of the palatals and many others of this nature.

defects of this nature from other parts of the work. Such is specially in the second *Adhyāya*, where a large portion of the cited rules leaves much to be desired both with regard to the composition and the contents and there was missing something sometimes entirely and sometimes partly : cf II, 8. 10. 12-15. 19-22. 30. 38-41. 57. 63. So also III, 17. 94. 138. IV, 3. 7. 17-23. 47. 59. 89. 102, V, 4. 17. 18. 20. 21. 37. There is disorder even in the arrangement of the subject-matter : e. g. the rules about the *Visarjanīya* do not stand together, but in two *Adhyāyas* III, 5-45. IV, 33-44 ; similarly scattered are the rules upon the *Padapāṭha* IV, 17-23. 26-32. 165-94.

Making allowances for such differences, which are to be placed purely in the author's account, there remains much in the list, which postulates a real difference from our *Vāj. S.*—too striking not to be correctly felt—and enables one to ascribe forthwith these mistakes to him in a manner that he mistakably ascribed to his *Samhitā*-text the concerned words—possibly because he became conversant with them from a different source—e.g. from the *Taittirīya*-or the *Ṛksamhitā*. It suggests further that to him the text of the *Vāj. S.* remained in a different recension—different from those of the *Mādhyandinas* and the *Kānvas* and also the fact that he does not mention it directly but by the general name *eke* cites the views of the different schools, that appeared before him ; now these views include also those of one of the two schools and one notes the author's independence of and difference from the views of both the schools and definite assertion for the preference of his own. So far as it concerns chiefly the absence of mention of the *Mādhyandinas* and *Kānvas*, the former are mentioned of course in VIII, 45—although this passage as well as the entire 8th *Adhyāya* are to be considered as later annexations (or the views expressed there as the doctrines of the *Mādhyandinas* are to be considered as partly deviating from those of the author), cf. my observations there. But the situation with the *Kānvas* appears to be somewhat different ; they are not mentioned directly but through their representative *Kāva* twice—in I, 23 and 149, to whom of course as an authority over the pronunciation of an accent and its related hand-movement our author does not seem to have lent his voice of concurrence. The word *eke* is frequently cited, viz. in III, 90. 127. 128. IV, 54. 125. 143. 185. V, 23. 44. VII, 8 ; here surely III, 90. IV, 125. V, 23. refer to the *Mādhyandinas*, but contrarily III, 127. 128. IV, 143. 155. V, 44' (according to the commentator) mean the *Kānvas* by the term or assume the texts of the latter to be embodying the views of the *eke* : in IV, 54 the *Kāva* school has been given a share only partly or completely with one example but incompletely with the second. In VII, 8 the *Kānvas* have been referred, but at the same time also the author of this work, who agrees with the *Kānvas* here on this particular point, since both the seventh and the eighth chapters are later interpolations of the *Mādhyandina* school—which intended to make its own system valid. On many occasions the commentary explains the text decisively also ² according to the views of this school (which he directly identifies with the *Vājasaneyinas*, such at I, 127. IV, 137.

2. It is sufficiently striking in as much as the commentary of the *Vāj. S.* coming from the same author seems to deal with the same in the *Kāva* school.

44) and seeks to represent here and there the rules of the same, which do not stand in agreement with those of it (see at I, 120. IV, 136. 137, where it mentions Aujjhihāyana³ as a branch of the Mādhyandina) as *paramatam* (i. e. the view of others), indeed once it expressly mentions such a rule as the view *carakāṇām* (of the Carakas) (cf. this with what has been stated above at III, 256. 257) ! In this latter case, in fact, the statement of the author—that intervocalic *j* in the interior of a word becomes changed to *y*, greatly differs from that of both the texts of the *V. S.* extant before us—indeed from the practice of all our Vedic texts in general and establishes an absolute difference of his Vājesaneyaka from that of the present. In the statement that the sound *khy* in root *khyā* is to be pronounced as *kṣ* occurring in IV, 164 the author shows himself to be belonging to the Gārgya ; now if in a *śloka* quoted by the commentator in IV, 174 a Kānva-Gārgya is mentioned one becomes tempted to claim that manner of expression of the Gārgyas as also belonging to the Kānvas and not merely of Carakas, which the commentator has done. According to the statement of the latter at IV, 21 (cf. 188) 100 (cf. III, 11) there exists a close relation between the Kānvas and Śākaṭāyana standing as a rival to Gārgya in the *Ṛk-prātiśākhya* : in fact we find an agreement of this nature between III, 86 (*pari naḥ*) and IV, 126 (*lopa* or *leṣa* of final *y* and *v* before vowels) : two other rules of Śākaṭāyana—IV, 4 (e.g. *tapūṣi*, not *tapūṣi*) and III, 8 (the transformation of *Visarjanīya* before *ś, ṣ, s* in the same) are not noticed in the present manuscripts of Kānva school, certainly III, 11 (*jihvāmūliya* and *upadhīmāniya*) and IV, 188 are exactly so scarce, though the evidence of the commentary at IV, 100 and 21 decisively want it. The Kānva school stands on the views of a man who in the *Ṛk-prātiśākhya* as also elsewhere appears as a very important authority : perhaps here too the practice of writing *l, lh* for *d, dh* common with *Ṛk*⁴—so also the precise adaptation to the readings of the *Ṛk* in a *ṛc* quoted in the *V. S.*, is to be traced to the Kānvas. Indeed does not the very name Kānva lead to a closer relationship with the *Ṛk* ? Apart from the mention of Madiandinoi by Arrian (or Megasthenes)—which I am inclined to connect with the Mādhyandina school, the latter did not enjoy any outward recognition or authority with which it could be invested and therefore it could be assumed to be secondary development. In fact the author of the *Nirukti* cites from the Kānva recension and he also mentions the *Kāṇhakam* (see above III, 474-76) but not the Mādhyandina. The claims of the Kānvas for superiority have been warmly advocated even still in the very recent time by Rāmakṛṣṇa in his introduction of the commentary of Pāraskara's *Gṛhyasūtra* and he appears here as a follower of the same.

We now enter into the problem of ascertaining other authorities, whom our author mentions besides Gārgya and Śākaṭāyana. In association and agreement with the latter it flashes before us the name of Kāśyapa (IV,4), whom Pāṇini (VIII,4.67) mentions (besides Gārgya and Gālava) and whose family is well represented in the

3. According to the *Varāha. Mith.* XIV. 2 the Ujjhānas (certainly not Ujjhāyana) are a tribe in the Middle Hindusthan, which would agree with Madiandinoi.

4. Appearing here according to the *Ṛk-prātiśākhya* (Müller I,53) from Vedamitra.

Vamśa list of the *Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka* (in both schools). Then in III, 9. 10 Śākalya is mentioned, whose view stands in glaring contrast to many of Śākaṭāyana, just as this happens in the case of Pāṇini VIII. 3, 18. 19. 4, 50. 51 twice with regard to other subjects. The author of this work, like Pāṇini, cannot decisively choose one of the two opposite views but holds both as equally justified—and it so happens because both hold their respective schools as the representatives of their views. The view of Śākalya (maintaining *visarga* before *ś, ṣ, s, k, kh, p, ph*) is decisively the one followed by the Mādhyandinas, but at the same time with regard to that which concerns the *jihvāmūliya* and *upadhmāniya* it stands in contrast to the teaching of the *Ṛk-prātiśākhya* which, although it followed the school of Śākala, acknowledges both these two sounds, see Müller I.250-254. The phenomenon of aspiration of final consonants before *ś, ṣ, s*, which is ascribed⁵ to Śaunaka in IV, 119, is in fact found again in the *Śaunakiyam Prātiśākhyam* of the *Atharvaveda*; but it is partly observed also in a manuscript of the Mādhyandian school and forms a special instruction of the Pauṣkarasādi:—Besides Śākaṭāyana the most celebrated teacher is Jātūkarṇya, mentioned in IV, 122 (according to which *hṛ* stands unchanged after a *sparśa*, which is mentioned also in the *Taittirīya-pr.* as the view of some *ekeṣām*), IV, 157 (according to which Kāśyapa is read as Kaśśapa) and V, 22 (according to which *pārāvata* and *āgnimāruta* are treated as *Avagṛhya*; in the last word the *Padapāṭha* of the Mādhyandian agrees with it).—There is the mention of Dālbhya in IV, 15, who considers the insertion *k* or *t* between *ñ*, *n* and *s* as unnecessary.—Finally there is the mention of Aupaśivi in III, 130, who in certain cases prefers the use of the *Anusvāra* to the nasalization of the *Upadhā*-vowel. Among all these teachers he is the single one whom we cannot know from other sources. Among the remaining names that of Dālbhya is known from the *Kauṣītaki-brāhmaṇa*, the *Chāndogyopa*. and the *Kāṭhaka* (see above III, 47). Śākalya is known from the second part of the *Śatap.-br.* (XI and XIV), the *Aitareya-ār.*, the *Ṛk-pr.* and the *Nirukti* (See Roth *Lit.* 64, *Nirukti* page 222); Śaunaka is known furthermore from *Śatap.* XI. XIII. XIV, from the *Chāndogyopa.*, *Muṇḍakopa.*, *Ṛk-pr.*, *Atharva-prātiśākhya*, *Bṛhaddevatā* so also from the different tradition of the *Ṛgveda* and the *Atharvaveda*; Jātūkarṇya is known from the *Aitareya* and the *Bṛhad Āraṇyaka*, in the latter of which he appears as the disciple of Yāska, so also from the *Śāṅkhyāyana* and the *Kāṭiya Śrautasūtra*. Kāśyapa is known from the *Bṛhad - Ar.*; so is also Gārgya, who is known also from the *Kāṭhaka* (see above III, 475), the *Kauṣītaki-up.*, the *Lāṭyāyana* - and *Kauśika-sūtra* and the *Ṛk-prātiśākhya*. The name Śākaṭāyana does not indeed appear in any Brāhmaṇa work and is by all means the youngest among those names. His individual personality or that of a grammatical school of this name is more assuredly responsible for it as the case is with other—more or less purely unbelievable names. Along with Gārgya and Śākalya he is also known from the *Ṛk-prātiśākhya* and the *Nirukti* (or *Bṛhaddevatā*), along with Kāśyapa also from Pāṇini, and along with Śaunaka also from the *Atharva-prātiśākhya* (so also the *Ṛk-pr.*). Among all these names

5. Roth in *Literature and History* page 61, 62.

there is not a single which does not lay claim over certain amount of antiquity. The common appearance of the same very authorities makes all these works entitled to some dates, which are not mutually separated by a longer period, but are on the whole identical. Here we are to investigate minutely as to which of these works are to be considered older and which ones younger. In the following I, therefore, make an attempt to ascertain the relationship of the *Vājasaneyi-pr.* with all these works successively and connect to all of them also the *Taittirīya-prātiśākhya*, which substantially belongs to them and whose divergence in the mentioned names of teachers might be chiefly of a geographical nature.

So far as the *Ṛk-prātiśākhya* is concerned, I withheld myself from giving any definite judgment upon it until this difficult work, constituted of parts varying due to the divergence of times, remained before us in the excellent treatments of Regnier (*Paṭala* I-V in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1856 Febrier-Mar. pag. 163-239, Avril-Mai. pag. 344-408 Juin pag. 445-474 ; Sept.-Oct. pag. 255-315 ; Nov.-Dec. pag. 482-526) and also in Müller's edition of the *Ṛk-saṃhitā* appearing at Brochhaus, Introduction page I-CXXVIII (*Paṭala* I-VI). I have not been able to trace any direct connection of the *Vāj.-pr.* with it ; probably it might be borrowed from I, 166-III, 42. The *Varṇasamāmnāya* (I. 33) serving as the subject-matter of the *Vāj.-pr.* must have been similar to that which occurs quoted at the beginning of the *Ṛk. pr.* so much so that it cites *l* after the simple vowels and diphthongs. The name *soṣman* of the ten *sparśa* aspirates, which appears here I, 54 is stated to be an expression of the *Pūrvācāryya* : it does not itself appear in the work. The *Ṛk.-pr.* knows it just as much as the *Ath.-pr.* The teaching of the *Krama-pāṭha* has been treated in the *Vāj.-pr.* in a form slightly different from that of the *Ṛk.-pr.* and indeed in a very archaic manner : see at IV, 194. The last two *Adhyāyas* of the *Vāj.-pr.*, which I consider to be later supplements, distinguish themselves from the preceding by the fact that in VII, 2 the root *grah + pari* has been used in the very sense in which it has been used in the *Ṛk.-pr.* and also that in VIII, 54.55 a verse has been quoted, which occurs also in the *paṭala* XII of the *Ṛk.-pr.* The simple terminology of both the works is in most cases identical, ⁶ but beside it the *Vāj.-pr.* has in other cases its distinctive features, which proclaim its further progress,—a fact, which has been treated below.

(To be continued)

6. I incidentally make here certain observations on the appearance of grammatical expressions in the ceremonial *sūtra*. A not very insignificant part of such terms is mentioned in the *Śrautasūtra* of Śāṅkhyāyana, thus *Vyākṛāṇa* I.1,19 :—*okārah plutas trimātraḥ śuddho makārānto vā*. I,1,20 :—*rāluṣṭhāna* for *e*, at I,2,4 :—*oṣṭhyasthāna* for *o*; au I,2,5 :—*saṃdhyakṣara* Diphthong I,2,4 :—*pragṭhya* I,2,7 : *visarjanīya riphito repham āpadyate, lupyate riphitaḥ* 1,2,9. 10 ;—*upadruta* (an expression of *Bāṣkala* for *udgrāhavant* I, 136) *abhinihita, praśqliṣṭa, kṣiprasandhi* XII, 13. 5 : *pañcāla padavṛtti, vivṛtti* XII, 5. 6.—cf. *nāman* substantive in the *Kaṭiyaśrautasūtra* V, 4. 5. - the *Gṛhya sūtras* as acquainted with *kṛt, taddhita, ghoṣavant, antaḥsthā, abhiniṣṭhāna, ācāra dīrgha*—which in their entirety are mentioned as children at the time of naming (*Pāraskara* I, 17 *Gobhila* II, 8 *Śāṅkh* I, 24. *Āśvala* I, 15). In III, 16 towards the end *Pāraskara* possesses still a passage, which maintains a not very clear but peculiar expression : there it is stated “*svara-karaṇa-kaṇṭṭhaurasa-dantyausthā-graṇa-dhāraṇa-occāraṇa-śaktir-mayi bhavatu*” “may there be in me the power to understand, to retain and to express syllables bear-

The *Nir.* shares with the *Vāj.-pr.* the contrast of *bhāṣāyām-anvadyāyām Nir.* I.4 5., *bhāṣikāḥ-naigamāḥ Nir.* II. 2 ; so here *vedeṣu bhāṣyeṣu Vāj.-pr.* I, 18. 19 : cf. here my Acad. lectures page 56. 139. 167. The expressions *Kṛt* and *taddhita* occur in both works namely *Kṛt* in *Nir.* I, 14, II.2. *Vāj.-pr.* I,27. V, 30, VI, 4 and *taddhita* in *Nir.* II, 3. 5. (*taddhita*). *Vāj.-pr.* I. 27. V, 8 9 : similarly *samāsa Nir.* II,3. *Vāj.-pr.* V. 1. The three *vacanas* numbers,⁷ then the *vibhakti* case forms, the enumeration of the cases (*ṣaṣṭhī Vāj.-pr.* I, 136. II, 18 ; *saptamī* III, 138) *upadhā Nir.* II, 1 *avagraha* I,17, *nāman ākhyātam upasarga nipāta* I, 1 belong to the *Vāj.-pr.* as also the *Ṛk -pr.* : contrarily *Kāritam* causals *Nir.* I,13 the three *puruṣas* of the verb *Nir.* VII, 1. 2, *sarvanāman*, pronoun *ibid*, *abhyāsa Nir.* V,12 *prakṛti* and *vikṛti Nir.* II, 3 verbal root and derivation appear at first in the *Nirukti* : these are unknown to the *Vāj.-pr.*, perhaps because there was no suitable occasion for them. Now since *Jātūkarnya*, one of the authorities of the same (i. e. *Vāj.-pr.*) is mentioned as a disciple of Yāska in the *Vaṃśa* of the *Bṛhad-Ār.* (II, 6, 3, IV, 6, 3) it decisively states Yāska's priority to the *Vāj.-pr.* The Mādhyandina school thrusts even two other more in between and knows still a second, much younger *Jātūkarnya*. There must have been certainly an older one, who might have been mentioned in the *Vāj.-pr.* These names are not quite sufficient for the assumption of the identity of persons. Yāska in the *Bṛhad-Ār.* might be somebody other than Yāska, the author of the *Nirukti*, see above III, 475-476 from the *Kāṭhaka*, that has been stated about Yāska *Gairikṣitās*. For the teachers mentioned by Yāska see Roth *Nir.* page 22 ; among them there occur four, who end in *āyana*, namely *Āgryāyana*, *Audumbarāyana*⁸ *Vārṣāyaṇin* and *Śākaṭāyana*, common to the *Vāj.-pr.*

ing accent (*svarakaraṇa*, placed in two parts), the guttural sound (*akuḥa visarjanīyāḥ* comm), the sounds pronounced from the breast, the dental sounds (*ṭulasāḥ* comm) and the labial sounds (*upūpadhmānīyāḥ* comm)." The commentator explains *aurasāḥ* as *sahakāravarga-pañcamāntasthāḥ* i.e. the five nasals besides the semivowels and h, which are entirely impossible. According to the position between *Kaṇṭhya* and *Dantya* the palatals and linguals must be indicated, which also do not suit well. Besides there are wanting still the remaining sibilants so also properly the vowels themselves. On *uras* see at I, 30. 31.

7. The earliest mentioned of the same occurs in the *Śatap.* xiii, 5, 1. 18 in which book as well as in another passage a grammatical investigation has been made ; c. f. my note at xiii, 4, 1, 13 at the page 1018 of the edition.

8. Udumbara is the name of a stem of the *Sālva*, according to the commentary of Pāṇini iv, 1, 173 ; ii, 4, 58.

I do not possess the *Taittirīya-prātiśākhya* completely, because the Oxford manuscript (Bodl. Wils. 504) . of which a copy was given to me, did not possess the first five pages (upto the end of I, 4). The work becomes quite noted (cf. Roth in his *Lit* p 65, 66) on account of the mention of a large number of teachers, which could not be available any where else in such a position. There occur many patronymics with *āyana*, beside which partly also the relevant simple forms appear : thus Āgñiveśyāyana (also in the *Aitr. Aranyaka*) II, 2 beside Āgñiveśya I, 9, and Plākṣāyana beside or after Plākṣi I, 9. II, 2 (twice). 6 (plākṣi alone I, 5) :—further Śaityāyana I, 5. II, 5 (twice). 6. Śāṅkhyāyana II, 3 and Kāṇḍamāyana I, 9. II, 3. The names of Agñiveśyāyana, Pauṣkarasādi (I, 5 II, 1 2. 5) and Kauṇḍinya (I, 5. II, 5. 7) appear among the contemporaries of the Buddha.⁹ Kauṇḍinya leads us (s. above I, 47) to Vidarbha (Berār), while Kauhaliṣputra II, 5 to the north (cf. *Varāhamihira* XIV, 27). By Ptākṣi (also in *Taitt. Ār.* I, 7) and Plākṣāyana one can think of the source-region of the Sarasvatī (s. above I, 35), and so also by Mācākīya I, 10 of the Maśaka Gārgya and of Massaga situated in the North-west (s. Lassen *Indien* I, 422. II, 130). The names Ātreya I, 5. II, 5. Bhāradvāja II, 5 Gautama I, 5. Sāmkrtya I, 8. 10. II, 4. Hārīta II, 2 Vātsapra I, 10 do not give any clue to a historical fact due to their indecisive nature. Contrarily the name of Vālmīki I, 5. 9. II, 6 is of much interest, whose mention in the present case is no less surprising and who does not retain by any means a very archaic character. A very striking formation is provided by Vāṭabhikāra II, 2, so also by Uttamottariya ¹⁰ I, 8. The name Ukhya I, 8. 10. II, 4 goes back to Ukha, which is otherwise known traditionally, see above III, 397 and cf. aukhiya above at III, 271. There appear as common designations the words *eke* very frequently I, 5. 8. II, 1. 2 (thrice) 3 (twice) 6. 7. 9, then *mimāṃsakās* I, 5 *Ahvarakās* towards the end and *Taittirīyakās* II, 11. Of all these names Bhāradvāja is mentioned in *Pāṇini* (and in *Kāṭiya Śrautasūtra*) and Pauṣkarasādi in *Kātyāyana*, the author of the *Vārttika* : the Plākṣās appear in the commentary of *Pāṇini* IV, I, 95. 2. 12) (if in the *Mahābhāṣya* ?); also the *Gaṇapāṭha* contains some of them : Kauhaliyas occur in the *Gobhila Gṛhya* II, 4. 9.—but they are unknown in other *sūtra* literatures. Their large number is extremely peculiar, so is also specially the manner in which they have been cited with their mutually contradictory views. In most cases there is no precision in the interpretation in the *Taitt. pr.*, which seems to justify all these conflicting views. The reason for this lies in the fragmentary yet comprehensive character of the *Taitt. Saṃhitā* itself. On the face of the divergent origin of the pieces, which are absolutely checkered, one could not acquire any unity in their recitation or pronunciation. The character of the small work itself is very simple and is restricted essentially to the pronunciation of the alphabets. The terminology is exactly the same as in the *Ṛk. pr.*, with which specially agrees the theory of three-times seven *yama* (II, 10. 11 *Ṛk. pr.*, XIII, 17) of the pitch. So far as the *Svarita* there occur certain differences. Three *ślokas* form the conclusion of the

9. On Vyākaraṇa Kauṇḍinya see Burnouf, *Intr. ā I' hist du Buddh.* p. 530. Lotus, d. la. b. 1. 489.

10. Roth at *Lit.* p. 57 note mentions two schools but I might consider it as one organisation as Aitareya, Ānyatāreya.

work—which occur as verses 5, 5, 8 at page VIII in the introduction of the *Ṛk.-pr.* by Müller. Direct connections with the *Vāj pr.* do not occur. I have added thoroughly to the individual rules of the same the corresponding rules of the *Tuitt. pr.*; I do not venture to hope that I have hit the mark in their translation in the absence of a commentary.

The *Atharva-prātiśākhya*¹¹ is arranged most systematically and it is, therefore, the youngest of all the *Prātiśākhyas*. It shares along with the *Ṛk. pr.* the mention of *Ānyata-areya* III, 75 (but missing in B) and *Śākaṭāyana* II, 24 (which rule we find again directly in *Pāṇini* III, 3 and ascribed to *Śākaṭāyana*), IV, 1. Śaunaka himself, to whose school (thus the Śaunakinas, *Kauśikasūtra* 85) the work belongs according to the post-script at the end (*iti Śaunakiye caturadhyāyike*) is mentioned once I, 9 and that too scornfully: *eke* is mentioned very frequently, thus I, 32. 10. 1 but more frequently in the commentary which cites a large number of grammatical extracts in the form of *Kārikās* and introduce them mostly with the words *apara āha*.¹² Directly he mentions only Vātsyā at II, 6 and Śāṅkhamitra at I, 93. II, 6. III, 75. Also the views *Ānyatareya* and *Śākaṭāyana* are produced by him—which of course do not belong to the text. The terminology of this work is gathered from various sources: in the first place a great part of the relevant expressions is identical with that of the *Ṛk prātiśākhya* e.g. *upācāra*, *īṅya*, *śuddha*, *nāmyupadha*, *abhinidhāna*, *samāpatti*, *samāpādyā*, *vināma* etc. It shares others with *Nirukti*—thus *kāritam* IV, 90 *sarvanāman* II, 44. IV, 64, *abhyāsa* II, 91. 93, IV, 8., *taddhita* IV, 12 (also in *Vāj. Pr.*), again others with the *Vāj. Pr.* thus: *bahulam* III, 8. 13. 17 (*Vāj. Pr.* III, 17), *aṇumātra* III, 65 (*Vāj. pr.* I, 61) *pratvaya* Affix II, 87. III, 3 (*Vāj. pr.* V, 13), *Vṛddha* together with *Vṛddhi* IV, 54 (*Vāj. pr.* IV, 29) *carcā* IV, 73 122 (*Vāj pr.* III, 19. IV, 17. 91 also in *Ṛk pr.* paṭ XV), *parvan* member of the compound IV, 52 (XXX *Vāj. pr.* 1, 149. V, 7) *āgama* euphonic insertion III, 97. IV, 59 (*Vāj. pr.* 1, 137), *āmreḍita* repetition IV, 39 (*Vāj. pr.* 1, 146. IV, 8. V, 18, 111, 3) : indeed all of these appear as expressions used by Pāṇini as are *ādeśa* substitute 1, 63. 11, 84. 111, 66. IV, 114, *prātipadika* 111, 79, *Karmapravacanīya* IV, 3, *vibhāṣā* 1. 2 - contrarily *pañcapadī* for indicating the strong case 1, 88. III, 5. 59 *bhūtakaraṇa* augment of the preterite III, 48 (Comp. *Vāj. pr.* 11, 45. V, 11), *parihāra* V, 73, 117 and *parihārya* IV. 116 in the sense of *parigraha* and *parigrhys* used in the *Ṛk. pr.*, *padya*=*padāntya* 1, 4, *āsthāpitam* 1, 48 and IV, 125 *abhinīṣṭāna* 1, 42, *tanmānin* IV, 28, *jaratparvan* IV, 52, *karṣaṇa* II, 39x are in fact peculiar

11. The Chambers manuscript of the same, which appears to be unicum up to now, unfortunately does not provide a complete reconstruction of the text although the same is twice represented there: once namely as such (=A), then in the very brief commentary (=C), finally once more as repetition before the following *sūtras*, with which the preceding being in combination always form the type of a Kramapadam. The concluding *sūtra* of a *pāda* is as a rule simply repeated (=B). The manuscript is unfortunately highly inaccurate; sometimes A misses something, sometimes B and sometimes C, and very frequently the readings themselves are in all the places absolutely corrupt.

12. Once it rectifies the text entirely in the form of the *Vārttika*; at III, 42 (*śimante hrasvaḥ*) namely it states: *Keśaveṣṭeti vaktavyam, yo hi śimno antaḥ śimantaḥ saḥ*: if this word does not occur really in the *Ath. S.*, about which I am not certain, the rectification is absolutely uncalled-for.

to the *Ath. pr.* itself. The algebraical terms, such as *san* Desiderative I, 86 *tātil* Affix *tāti* IV, 20 *tutva=nati* IV, 73 *suñ* particle *su* II, 97 *uñ* particle *u* III, 4 so also the remaining numerous *gaṇas*, whose usage is quite unknown in other *prātiśākhya*s speak in favour of the view that we find here a stage immediately preceding that of Pāṇini, which is substantiated in great details by the use of a large number of examples (only the *Vāj. pr.* once V, 38 cites one of this nature) : thus I, 65. 66. 85. II, 59. 67. 80. 84. 85. 94 etc. : amongst them there occurs one III, 88 *kṣubhnādīnām*, which is cited also in *Pāṇini* (III. 4. 39). The enumeration of words, which occur in the concerned *gaṇa* is wanting in the most cases, since the commentary cites as a rule in most cases a few examples only : naturally the same must be considered as to have been quoted entirely from the *Ath. Samhitā* : thus for instance the examples of the commentary on the *kṣubhnādigaṇa* (*Kṣubhanāti parinṛtyamtyor ira madhunā prāpiṇāḥ parinṛtyanti keśinīḥ*) do not agree with the sequence of the *Gaṇapāṭha* of Pāṇini. Now that here the *Ath. pr.* is to be considered later than Pāṇini does not seem believable to me since besides these few examples of algebraical nature it contains partly very archaic terminology. Rather it stands as an evidence to me that Pāṇini must have got certain predecessors in the matter of his application of special mode of expressions and himself cannot be considered as the solitary introducer of this style. Further evidence in support of the same will come from what follows. So far as the relation between the *Ath. pr.* and the *Vāj. pr.* is concerned it is on the whole pretty close. At the first place a rule regarding the aspiration of the final consonants before *ś, ṣ, s*, which is ascribed to Śaunaka in the *Vāj.-pr.* IV, 119, appears in fact in the *Ath. pr.* II, 6 - and it stands as a very substantial evidence for the fact that the *Ath. pr.* is a work of the Śaunaka school, which is based chiefly on the post-script of the work. Then the subjects, treated in the both works, are on the whole identical ; they are limited to the same extent and are represented in the same manner and succession—a fact, which becomes clear from this brief survey of the contents of the *Ath. pr.* : Names and modes of formations of the sounds upto I, 50 : quantity and extent of syllables 51-62 : Nasalization of a sound 67-73, 83-91 : *parigṛhyam* 73-82 *saṃyoga, yama nāsikya, svarabhakti, pluta* upto 105.—common rules on the union of consonants II, 1-39 : *visarjanīya* 40-80 : *ṣakāra* 81-107.—Lengthening III, 1-24. Doubling 25-36. The union of vowels 37-53. Accents 54-75. Transformation of the dentals to linguals 76-52.¹³—The separation of compounds into the *Padapāṭha* IV, 1-46. Non appearance of the same 47-51. The citation of an original form of a word in the *Padapāṭha* through the *Carcā* and *Parihāra* 72-100 The purpose of the Veda or of the *Kramapāṭha* of the same, and its manner 101-127. While giving the rules of the *Vāj. Pr.* I have throughout put side by side the rules of the *Ath. pr.* for contrast, at least their comparison will best throw light on the close relationship between them.

We now come to the very topic of Pāṇini for ascertaining the relations, which exist between his grammar and the *Vāj.-pr.* These are partly very close, since a large number of rules of the *Vāj.-pr.* occur word for word or almost word for word in the

13. The Codex cites 105 as the number of the *sūtras* of this *Adhyāya*.

grammar of Pāṇini ; further like Pāṇini the *Vāj.-pr.* also uses here and there a terminology, which is algebraic by nature—on the other hand there occurs a big gulf between them, as this algebraic terminology of the *Vāj.-pr.*, like that of the *Ath. pr.*, does not agree with that of Pāṇini rather it appears remarkably different from it at some portions. The detail stands as what follows : In the first place there is agreement with Pāṇini in *tiñ* I, 27 *āñ* VI, 24 (*A* reads merely *ā*) *luk* III, 12 *lup* I, 114 (*lup* or *lopa* occurs for many times even in the *Ṛk. pr.* and the *Taitt. pr.*) : here the use of *t* in *et* and *ot* I, 114. IV, 58 can also be counted, and of the non-algebraic expressions *upapadam* IV, 14. 23, *yadvṛttam* VI, 14 (cf. *Pāṇini* VIII. 1. 48 Kimvṛtta) *anudeśa* I, 143 *dhātu* ¹⁴ verbal stem V, 10 *anyataratas* V, 15 (*Pāṇ. anyatarasyām*) *liṅga* gender IV, 170 (only in BE) *saṃjñā* IV, 96. The following algebraic terms, which exclusively belong to the *Vāj. pr* and cannot be traced ¹⁵ any where else up till now, are : *sim* I, 44. IV, 50 for the eight simple vowels, *jī* I, 50. 167. III, 12. IV. 118 for the surds including the sibilants (except *h*) *mud* I, 52. III, 8. 12. IV, 199 for *ś, ṣ, s, dhi* I, 53, 37, 117 for the sonants ¹⁶ : Of these still *bhāvin* I, 46. III, 21. 55 IV, 33, 45 VI, 9 representing all the vowels except *ā*, *rit*=*riphit* IV, 33. VI, 9 and *saṃkrama* III, 148 IV, 77. 165. 194 stand as names exclusively peculiar to the *Vāj. pr.*—If with tolerable definiteness it can be guaranteed that the technical terms of the *Vāj. pr.* are independent of those of Pāṇini we can either surmise multifarious verbal agreements as elements borrowed from the common source ¹⁷ or the same may be conceived as the adaptations from the *Vāj. pr.*—exactly the choice that remains for the rules which occur both in the *Kātiya Śrautasūtra* I, 8, 1^o. 20 and *Pāṇini* I. 2. 33-34. In the second case the first assumption gets the preference (comp. also *Vāj. pr.* I, 130) ; in our case here contrarily on account of great speciality of a few relevant rules I might decide in favour of the view of direct borrowing by Pāṇini. Apart from much—developed atgebraic terminology the definite posterity of the latter seems to proceed from the fact that the pronunciation of short *a* became so much closed at his time that he conceives not this vowel *a* but *u* as the norm for the remaining vowels, while the *Vāj. pr.* (so also the *Ath. pr.*) maintains the *saṃvṛta ā* of the *a* vowel, nevertheless considers it as the purest vowel, cf. what has been observed in I. 72. Here the difference of place might have at the basis of such disparity, as Pāṇini belonged to the Northwest and the *Vāj. pr.* to the east. In justification of the view that the *Vāj. pr.* is later than Pāṇini one can probably cite that the author of the *Vārttika* of Pāṇini bears the same name as the author of the *Vāj. pr.* : in fact between them there occur some direct differences cf. (III, 85) IV. 119. The similarity of name does not usually indicate the identity of

14. In the *Ṛk. pr.* I, 432 Müller explains *dhātu* as 'word' in general, but in I, 397 as 'the verbal stem'.

15. If belonging to the east ? cf. Bohtlingk 'On the accent in Sanskrit', page 64 and *āñ aūñ* in Pāṇini.

16. These four expressions correspond to the *saṃākṣara*, *aḥṣa*, *uṣman* and *g hoṣavant* of the three remaining *Prātiśākyas*.

17. The words, expressed in the *Lit.* by Roth at the page 56, occur as : "*Parah sannikarṣaḥ saṃhitā*", which appear in *Pāṇini* (I, 4, 109). It possesses a meaning different from that of the *Nirukti* (I, 17) : there in Pāṇini the same points to the alphabets, but here in the *N.* to the words

persons with regard to names like Kātyāyana : at least they are shown to be members or the adherents of the same school of Kātās. Among the *sūtras*, which occur uniformly in common both in the *Vāj. pr.* and Pāṇini, some common rules at the very place became specially prominent—which are of great significance for the economy of the entire arrangement¹⁸ of the respective texts and which considered from the standpoint of special characteristics in fact seem to indicate with pretty definiteness the borrowing by one from the other. These (called *paribhāṣās* by the commentator of Pāṇini) are the three among them : *tasmin iti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya Vāj. pr.* I, 134 *Pāṇ.* I. 1. 66—*tasmanādityuttarasyaādeḥ Vāj. pr.* I, 135 *Pāṇ.* I. 1. 67 (without *ādeḥ* see above 54) : *ṣaṣṭhi sthāneyogā Vāj. pr.* I, 136. *Pāṇ.* I. 1. 49. Also notable are : *saṃkhyātānām anudeśo yathāsaṃkhyam Vāj. pr.* I, 143 as contrary to *yathā saṃkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām Pāṇ.* I. 3. 10. and *vipratīṣedhe uttaram belavad alope* I. 159 as contrary to *vipratīṣedhe param kāryam Pāṇ.* I. 4. 2.; both of them do not become subject to a special condition, but can be traced to a common source in the universal grammatical tradition (i. e. to the *sāmānya* of the *Ath. pr.* I, 3 *evam iheti ca vibhāṣāprāptam sāmānye*). Likewise *varṇasyādarśanam lopah I, 141 Pāṇ.* I. 1. 60 (without *varṇasya*) : *uccair udāttaḥ nīcāir anudāttaḥ ubhayavān svaritaḥ I, 108-110 Pāṇ.* L. 2. 29-31 (where *samāhrah* instead of *ubh*) :—*tasyādītaḥ udāttaḥ svarārdhamātram I, 126 Pāṇ.* I. 2. 32 (where *ardhahrasvam*) : *udātīāc cānudātīā svaritam nodāttaḥ svaritodayam IV, 134 140 udātīād anudātīasya svaritaḥ nodāttaḥ svaritodayam Pāṇ.* VIII, 4 66. 67. *samānasthānakaraṇāsyaprayatnaḥ savarṇaḥ I, 43 tulyāsyaprayatam savarṇam Pāṇ.* I. 1. 9 : *āsīd iti cottaram vicāre II, 53 upari svidāsīd iti ca Pāṇ.* VIII. 2. 102 (97) ;—*nuścāmreḍite VI, 8 kāmāmreḍite Pāṇ.* VIII. 3. 12 Besides there occur also a number of agreements e. g. IV. 49 (*Pāṇ.* VI. 1. 84) VI, 19-23 (*Pāṇ.* VIII. 1. 58-63), which can be explained as due to the identity of subject. In some of these cases the *Vāj. pr.* stands decisively behind Pāṇini (cf. II, 19. 20), there the grammatical exposition does not seem to have reached as yet the prospect and systematic perfection, which are represented in Pāṇini cf. what has been already stated in the introduction (p. 68) about the clumsiness and inadeptness of the author in general : but in most of the cases contrarily on account of his being restricted to one text of the *Vājas. Samhitā* he (i. e. the author of the *Vāj. pr.*) has stood in a more advantageous position than Pāṇini, to whom the entire vocabulary of the speech occurred as the subject for discussion and as such he (the author of the *Vāj. pr.*) could formulate rules with certain definiteness, in which Pāṇini could have either vacillated (*bahulam*) or would have reached a conclusion in an erroneous or biased manner (cf. II, 30. 35 III, 27 95. IV, 58)

From what has been discussed above it follows that there exists an uncommonly close connection between the *Vāj. pr.* and Pāṇini, and there is no other alternative than to place them in the same very period or in two periods which are not very far from each other. But certainly one does not gain much by that. Though Max Müller has expressed recently (in an appendix of his preface to the new edition) of the *Ṛksam-*

18. The latter offers generally in the principles followed sufficient uniformity with the system followed by Pāṇini, cf. what has been observed at the page 93.

hitā page 12) that to him nothing has appeared as yet by which the universal validity of Böhtlingk's evidence in support of the view that Pāṇini belongs to the fourth century B. C. can be injured, yet he has allowed thereby a not insignificant condition to pass out of his ken, which introduces a difference of 140-160 years in that calculation even if one would completely remain attached to it (i. e. the view of Böhtlingk) as Müller has done. The same depends not unsubstantially upon it that Abhimanyu, the king of Kashmir, at whose command the *Mahābhāṣya* was brought to his state through Candrar, according to the *Rājatarāṅginī*, lived probably before 100 B. C. : since Abhimanyu appears as the successor of Kaṇiṣka, whose time is settled by means of coins, we know with pretty definiteness that he governed probably during 40-65 A. D. In my Acad. lectures at page 201 (1852) I have pointed it out and it is striking that Müller has not taken any notice of this point. Another of the arguments, basing upon which Böhtlingk settles the date of Pāṇini, is that Amarasīṅha, who is younger than Pāṇini, lived towards the middle of the first century B. C. If Müller really considers this as an evidence, has no injury been done to it by what I have stated in a. a. O. pages 206-207 ? What remains then properly ? In the first place the above referred statement of the mythical history—the *Rājatarāṅginī* of the 12th century, then the statement of a collection of stories of the same time, which makes Pāṇini contemporaneous with Nanda, the predecessor of Sandrokuptos and finally the statement of Hiuen T'sang (I, 127) of the 7th century, which remains in the excellent translation of St. Julien—according to all these—the legend, current in pholotoulou i. e. Śālātura, the birth place of Pāṇini, states that he (Amarasīṅha) lived in the same very place (i. e. Śālātura) as a student of Pāṇini at a time 500 years after the death of Buddha or 100 years after Kaṇiṣka—thus 110-140 years after Christ—and nay there occurred a statue,¹⁹ which was erected in his honour. All these things by nature command respect in India, since all these traditions come from the very homeland of Pāṇini ; but are these sufficient to enable one to place Pāṇini definitely in the middle of the fourth century B. C. ?—or supported by the same is it proper to raise a structure of literary chronology as Müller has done, in as much as he fixes the date of Śaunaka, the author of the *Ṛk-prātiśākhya* sometime about 400 B. C.²⁰ on the consideration that he appeared before Pāṇini ? But what is definite is that from the vocables of Pāṇini

19. This is in fact highly proper but un-Indian and speaks of the Greek influence which was definitely perceptible in India in the period, in which the legend remained current. The entire work of Hiuen T'sang, as it remains to-day does not contain any instance of this nature. There occurs mention of the erection of statues only of the Buddha and other holy personalities like him.

20. To ascribe all the texts, related to the *Ṛgveda* and bearing the name of Śaunaka to the 4th century B. C. and to consider their statements agreeing with those of the texts of the present times as evidences in support of the occurrence of text relationship in the ancient period, which Müller has done at a. a. O. page 8, do not suit well even though Śaunaka is to be placed there ; besides there appear suddenly in the same very place two conflicting statements regarding the number of the verses in the *Ṛk saṃhitā* and also the extent of the same, since in the *Anuvākānukramaṇī* of Śaunaka immediately after the special counting of the individual *vargas* and their verses (2000 *vargas* with 10381 verses) there occurs the mention of the total number of *vargas* and their verses (2006 *vargas* with 10580½ verses) which deviates not insignificantly from the former, see above III, 255.

some indications about his date can be obtained. There occur the mention of Yavana (the Greek) and their script, which cannot be so easily set aside, as Müller has wanted to do. What sort of a role did the script of the Greeks play among the Indians before Alexander that they considered it necessary to apply a proper affix for the indication of the same so much so that the expression 'the Greek' meant also the script of the Greek? Such a familiarity of expression—rather of a long and frequent use becomes explained, as it is quite conceivable and natural in the home ²¹ of Pāṇini—the tract of land in North-West of India, occupied by the Greeks surely for a pretty long period after Alexander. The word *Grantha* used by Pāṇini on many occasions definitely refers according to his etymology, to the written text: likewise many of his technical expressions are based on graphic representation, e. g. *svāritat*, *udāttet* (see Böhtlingk at I. 3. 11) —a decisive progress upon the *Prātiśākhya* or the *Rk-prātiśākhya*, about which Müller has excellently proved that it refers to a spoken and not to a written text. Finally is to be cited here also the manifold mention of the beggar, specially also of the female beggar (*Pāṇ.* II 1. 70) ²² *śravaṇā* and in *gaṇa pravrajitā*—even if these had belonged to the brahmanical beggars (see Acad. lectures page 265)—since both presuppose ²³ a great flourishing of the Buddhism, which, though not has propagated the moving beggrrdom, ²⁴ has uncommonly favoured it, a progress, which has scarcely happened in the middle of the fourth century B. C. even in the homeland of Pāṇini—what to speak of the remaining part of India. ²⁵ A close investigation of the vocables of Pāṇini would provide us definitely with a number of such connecting links. Unfortunately so long as we do not possess the *Māhābhāṣya* it is not possible for us to do the work in any way, since only with the help of this word a critical examination of the text (i. e. the grammar of Pāṇini) can be done (cf. many such statements: *bhāṣye tu na vyākhyātam*). The move in the line which I have made already in I, 14166, has to be post-poned at the very beginning on account of the insufficiency of materials at our disposal. The *Gaṇapātha* is thus an uncertain ground, as one can depend upon it with very little confidence

After this digression, which the subject permits but from which nothing positive comes, we come back to our *Vājasaneyi prātiśākhya*. From our investigation into the relation of the same with the remaining similar works we come to such a conclusion that from the standpoint of terminology it is younger than the *Rkpr.*, *Nirukti*, *Taitt. pr.*—but contrarily stands in a very closer relation to the *Ath. pr.* and Pāṇini—probably forms one of the preceding steps of the latter. It is expressed by the uncommonly

21. cf. e. g. also IV, 2. 74 ff (certainly *blāṣye tu na vyākhātāni*), where he suggests that the names of the *Kūpas* are to be imagined as to be related to the 'north of the Vipāś': a special consideration for topography.

22. Certainly *blāṣye tu nedam vyākhatam*.

23. cf. also VIII, 2. 50 the expression *nirvāṇa*; the like in *devānām priya* in the *gaṇa bhavat* at V, 3, 14 and in *Vārttila* upon VI, 3, 21. The latter passages are not surely evidences for Pāṇini.

24. The begging of the *brahmacārin* in his village should not be identified with it.

25. Specially if one supports the statements of the Northern Buddhists—Kaṇiṣka (according to Lassen 10-40 p chr) lived 400 years after the Buddha.

elliptical nature, with which the start has been made, specially at the beginning cf. I, 5. 8. 9. 12-14 : The older the *sūtra* the more understandable it is, the more enigmatical it appears, the more expressive it is of the later origin" (Acad. vorles. page 15)—these words have found their right application here.—Here it would have been interesting to institute a special comparison of the nature and manner—as to how the individual works grammatically treat the examples, which they cite and how they inflect the same. A Regnier has made the beginning of a comparison of this type from the *Rk pr.* in a. a. O (February-March) at page 188. I give one such from the *Vāj. pr.* besides some examples from the *Ath. pr.* An investigation of this nature from Pāṇini is very commendable, specially due to the fact that in the verbal roots not an insignificant number of variants would follow from the *Dhātupāṭha*, which contains their names. Our text deals with the counting of alphabets ²⁶ (which borders on the range of terminology) in I, 36-41. Specially is to be noted the addition of *u* or *i* to the respective sound, thus *nu=n si=s mi=m, yi=y* (see at I, 39) : the formation with *a*, thus for example, *da=d* is known also to the *Rk pr.* : the short *a* (except through *Kaṇṭhya*) is indicated many times through *a* alone as in I, 38. 55 IV, 40. 145 (where the commentator has exchanged it with a privans). In the same way the themes of the verbal roots or affixes are formed by the annexation of *a, i, u* provided they do not preserve their consonantal stem : thus *a* in *sade* I, 48 (loc. from *sad*) *vr̥dha* III, 112 : *i* in *saheḥ* III, 121 *śaseḥ* III, 122. *ruhau* IV, 44 *vāhau* III, 44 and IV, 57 (with lengthening) : *Ath* IV, 67 *vyadhau*. 70 *sahau*.—*u* in *vāṃsau* V, 11 ; at least *Ath. pr.* has I, 88 *vasvantasya*. cf. also ibid *matau* III, 17. 47 *vatau* IV, 48 :—consonantal termination in *vr̥dhavr̥joh* III, 112. *styāstanoḥ* III, 68. *anindoḥ* III, 33 (according to conjecture) :—the *Ath. pr.* inflects also the vocalic final sound in : *das* Gen from *dā* III, 11 and *sthas* Gen from *sthā* II, 93. Otherwise the verbal roots are represented through the forms of the third pers. sing. of the pres indicative, thus *pātau* III, 27 *siñcatau* III, 45. 62 *sīdateḥ* III, 58 *net-imudatihinomīnān* III, 87 *añcatisahatyoh* V, 30 cf. *Ath. pr.* IV, 61-63 *dadātau*, *hanti-harati-sthā-stambhiṣu*, *dadhātau ca* 58 *karotau*.—Ready words are treated either as themes or as nominatives, thus *dyaves* III, 67 genitive from *dyavi*, *stuvantyām* loc. of *stuvanti* III, 70 *teṣu* III, 114 loc. plur. of *te*, *neḥ* genitive of *nī* III, 58 (contrarily in III, 68 of *nis*), *kṛdhau* III, 32 loc. from *kṛdhi*—*tatakṣau* III, 69 loc. of *tatakṣu*, *vājyanteṣu* III, 98 loc. plur. of *vājyantas*, ²⁷ *niyudbhiṣu* III, 120 the same case from *niyudbhis*, *rayivṛdhe* III, 136 loc. sing. of *rayivṛdhas* : cf. *kṛtve* loc. to *Kṛtvas* *Ath. pr.* IV, 26. The complete separation of the ending has taken place in IV, 5 in *samrāṭ-samrāji* (for *jyayoh*) : *dur* stands as uninflected in III, 41 : *opa prodāte* VI, 9 and others of this kind.

We come finally to a clear statement of contents and so also to a representation of critical and exegetical means, which come to help me for the reconstruction of the text.

26. Noticeable is *ekāra Ath. Pr.* IV. 68, which represents *akāra* and *ikāra* "*dr̥ṣī sarvanāmnaikār-āntena*" 'in *dr̥ṣī* there does not occur any separation (*avagraha*) from the pronominal *a* and *i*'.

27. cf. commentary at V, 3 *tamasah* Gen. form of the superlative affix *tama*.

The work divided into eight *Adhyāyas* comprising altogether 37 *khaṇḍas* and 742 *sūtras*. The division into *Adhyāya* is mentioned already in the text III, 18 ; it comes from the author himself and it shows in the very place (cf. comm. to IV, 1. 22) a careful arrangement of the matter. Also by the mention of *iti, iti ca* he seems to indicate the paragraph cf. comm. to III, 144 IV, 32. Other divisions are also marked, see 1, 33 III, 129 IV, 129 (where there occurs a difference from the existing text). Specially the difference of *Sandhi*-rules in special sections, cited in III, 3. 4. or marked by *hi* in IV, 10 and IV, 123 - which do not encroach upon one another, is quite proper and agrees entirely with the similar arrangement of materials, as noted adequately in Pāṇini. The expression *Kāla*-time employed for indicating 'section', points to the originally oral composition of the work, to which support is given by the elliptical rule I, 5. The last two *Adhyāyas* appear to me later additions—which do not come from the same author, who composed the first six chapters. I have produced my arguments in favour of the view in VII, 1 and VIII, 1. 45.

Adhyāya I contains at the first place in 1-4 a statement about the contents of this work :-5-15 origin of the vocal sound :-16-26 on the manner and method of the Vedic study :-27-28 the extent of speech material :-29-32 common rules on the modulation of sound :-33-54 technical terms : 55-61 rules of quantity :-62-75 *sthānam*, the organ of the alphabets :-76-84 *karaṇam*, the mode of producing the same :-85-91 final alphabets :-92-98 *pragṛhyam* :- 99-107 that, which belongs to the syllable :-108-120 the name and origin of the accent :-121-132 gesticulation there and application of the same : 133-145. 159. the rule of interpretation for the progress of the *Vāj. pr.* : 146-158 technical terms : 160-168 cases in which the final *visarjanīya* after *ā* standing in the *Padapāṭha* develops from *r* : 169 is a blessing coming repeatedly at the end of *Adhyāya*.

Adhyāya II about accents : *anudātṭam* 2-21, 52-53 : *ādyudātṭam* 22-45 : *dvyudātṭam* 46-48 : *tryudātṭam* 49 : *sarvodātṭam* 50. 51 : *antodātṭam* 54-56.

Adhyāya III *saṃskāra*, as the words occurring in the *Padapāṭha* are to be arranged in the *Samhitāpāṭha* :-*padam* 1 : *saṃdhi* 2 : -the rule of interpretation 3. 4. :- treatment of the *Visarjanīya* 5-16 20-45 :- the elision of *ni* 17 (a quite strange *sūtra*) :-the rules of this *Adhyāya* are not valid in the *Padapāṭha* before and after *iti* 18. 19 :- *nati* of a dental 39-48 : insertion of a sibilant 49-53 :- *dudukṣan* 54 :- the modification of *s* into *ṣ* 55-57 :- the change of *t, th* into *ṭ, ṭh*, 78 : *s* will not be changed to *ṣ* 79-82 :-*n* becomes to *ṇ* :- *n* remains 88-94 :-the lengthening of a vowel 95-128 :-the nasalization of a vowel 129-131 : -the final *n* 132-149.

Adhyāya IV the continuation of the *saṃskāra*. The final or interior *m, n* 1-9 :-10 punctuation :- 11 *m* before *sparsa* :- final *t, n, ṇ svarabhakti* 12-16 :- what is to be preserved in the *sthitopasthita* 17-23 (insertion ?) :- after vowels a *c* is to be placed before *ch* 24 :- exception 25 :-words, which should be pronounced with the *visarjanīya* or not with the *visarjanīya* in the *Padapāṭha* 26-32 (insertion ?) :-the treatment of the *visarjanīya* (from *s* or *r*) 33-34 :- union of vowels 45-91, and indeed 58-82 the suppression of *a* after *e* and *o* 83-91 irregular occurrence or non-occurrence of *sandhis* between two vowels :- *t* before

c, § 92-94 :- s after ud is elided, but becomes changed to t in *aśvattha* 95. 96 :-the doubling of the initial consonant of a group 97-103 :-ñ, n between vowels 104 :- long by position 105 :-the doubling of the aspiration 106 :-the non-occurrence of the doubling 107-115 :- the union of two *sparsās* in the sentence 116-120 :-the union of a *sparsā* with the following h 121-122 :-punctuation 123 :- the elision of y, v 124-127 :-the changes of accent at the concurrence or fusion of two accents 128-140 :-two *varṇas* are to be pronounced as one *varṇa* 141-148 :-cases where there occur two y. s. or one y or no y 149-159 : *yamapātti* and *sphoṭana* 160-162 :-j being changed to y, *khy* to *kṣ* 163-164 :-the omission of the there-staying passages in the *Padasaṃhitā* 165-178 :-the nature and manner of the *Kramapāṭha* 179-194.

Adhyāya V separation (*avagraha*) of words deserving the use of *avagraha* in the *Padapāṭha* 1-23 .- non occurrence of separation 24-45.

Adhyāya VI. Accent in the sentence. Loss of the same in the finite verb, or in the prepositions 1-4. Exceptional cases, where the preposition retains the accent 5-10, the the verb II-24 :- the non-occurrence of doubling (against IV 97 ff) and respectively doubled ñ 25-30 (insertion ?) *Adhyāya* VII : the euphonic combination of *iti* in the *Padapāṭha*. *Adhyāya* VIII : *varṇasamāmnāya*, alphabet 1-31. 43-47 :- the nature and manner of the Veda-study. 32-42 :- syllable, word 48-51 :- kind of words 53-57 :- *padagotrāṇi*, *padadevatās* 58-63 :- the statement of the author 64.

The textcodex, chambers 35=A gives the division into *Khaṇḍas*, separates each *sūtra* by a red mark and at the end of each *Adhyāya* (except the VIII) cites the number of the *sūtras* occurring in the *Khaṇḍa*. as a result of which there appears a great difference from the real contents of the text, which may be partly attributed to the negligent scribe. For particulars - please see the conclusion of the *Adhyāya*. - The excellent commentary of Uvaṭa, the son of Bhaṭṭa Vajraṭa from Ānandapura (Āora vāstavya) remained before me in a pretty correct copy (Chambers 454 fol 98) : at the end of the fourth and fifth *Adhyāyas* it is designated as *māṭṛmodakākhyam prāṭisākhyabhāṣyam*. Since Roth (in his *Lit.* p 54) cites the same from the only known Codex of this work (E. I. H 598=E) there occurs the probability that both the manuscripts are copies of the same manuscripts. In fact both the texts completely agree in all the passages, with regard to which I got information about the reading of E due to the friendliness of Roth. Contrarily there occur in our manuscript some very significant lacunas, which are unknown to E and for which the transcriber of the manuscript should be held responsible. The first lacuna between fol 17 and 18 extends from I, 137-144 (respectively I, 6, 30-37) : fol 18a begins *trāṣiś-abda ādyudātto bhavati*. The second lacuna between fol 56 and 57 starts from IV. 42-52 (respectively IV, 2, 17-3, 8) : fol. 56 ends : *sarvo aḥkāra okara*, fol. 57 begins *dyate yathā, varuṇa, ihi, varuṇeha bodhi, ā idam edam, aganma, uvarṇa okāram*. The third lacuna occurs in fol. 91 a, and includes VI, 19-22 (respectively VI, 2, 9-12) but is restored at the margin of 91 a (*samuccayo nāma—pūrvam ākhyātam prakṛtyā bhavati*). Besides there occur still not very insignificant defects that obstruct interpretation in the commentary to I, 103. III, 3. IV, 194. Besides it is easy to remove the inaccuracies of the manuscript. The text, communicated in it, which is placed above the explanation (and which I mark

as B, while the readings of the commentary as C) differs here and there, as stated earlier in constant agreement with E, not unsubstantially from A as much as in its wordings²⁸ as in the fact that it partly cites *sūtras* in a sequence different from that of A, namely I, 39. 40. 65. 66 VI, 21. 22 and partly recognises certain *sūtras*, which do not occur at all in A, as III, 1a. IV, 52 (b). 57 (a). 170, while A retains certain *sūtras*, which are unknown to B. C. E see at IV, 58. 185. The latter, which are known only in A, are, of course, pure mistakes; the former, which are known only to B. C. E partly seem to be omitted out mistakes in A as in IV, 52. 170 (compare V. 37) and partly appear as later additions, as in III, 1a IV, 57 a. Once the commentary itself takes cognisance of such an attempted interpolation and rejects it as *Apapāṭha*, namely at IV, 119. In three places all the four texts A. B. C. F have traced false readings, and I have seen myself pressed to conjectures, namely at V, 33. VI. 26. VIII, 56.

On the whole Uvaṭa's explanation is quite excellent although such passages are not wanting in which he partly or entirely misunderstood the sense, or to which he attributes false examples, or such which do not occur in the *VS* but in the *Brāhmaṇa*, cf at I, 6. 31. 32. 44. 120. 127. 129. III, 17. 80. IV, 10. 123. 135-137. 141. 143-145. 150. 156. 158. 174. 193. V, 11. 13. 14. 26. 29. 31 (33). 41. (VI, 26). Also there occur certain differences from the *Padapāṭha* see V, 41. Statements on deviating views of other teachers are on the whole rare but the same occur in those places where he seeks to justify the *Mādhyandinas*, whom he follows as against the contradictory views of the text. On some occasions he provides differing explanations as in I, 147. VI, 24. Here and there he cites passages from the *Ākṣapratīśākhya* as in I, 147. VI, 24: once with the name of Śaunaka himself at IV, 16. Among the remaining quotations, which are on the whole rare, but cited as *tathā cōktam* or *āha ca* there occur many, which are of the nature of *Kārikās* and stand attached to the text as in I, 120 (where it is ascribed to the *Aujjihāyanaka* just so as in IV, 136). 125. III, 19. IV, 1. 101, others which are independent of it (i. e. the text) and partly of not less interest are in I, 17. III, 135. IV, 162. 174. V, 45. VI, 14. Also the *Śikhṣās* are on many occasions partly mentioned and passages from the same are quoted, as in I, 72. 73. 85. A *Bhāsyakāra* is mentioned in IV, 179 and *Vaiyākaraṇa* at IV, 145. There occur still rarely quotations from Pāṇini, Śāntanācārya (VI. 24) Manu (VIII. 33) and the like. - unfortunately the accents are entirely wanting in the manuscript.

28. See as for examples I, 4. 15. 16. 79. 106. III, 19. 27. 49. 63. 64. 75. IV, 17. 96. 150. 163. (partly). 187. V, 14. 24. 26. 27. 48. VI, 5. 7. 23. 24. 27. 28. VII, 5. 8. (partly) VIII, 35. 47. 53, where E agrees in all the places with B. C: in I, III. III, 66 E agrees with A. and in III. 55. IV, 163 (partly) VII, 4. 8 (partly) VIII, 43 E seems to retain its own readings.

TRANSLATOR'S REVIEW OF WEBER'S INTRODUCTION

In his introduction to the *Vājasaneyi-prātiśākhya* Weber has expressed certain views, which have become subject to bitter controversy among the scholars. One of such is his statement about the relation between Pāṇini, the author of the grammatical text *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and *Kātyāyana*, the composer of the *Vājasaneyi-prātiśākhya*. According to him the *Vāj. pr.* was composed before the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and Pāṇini was indebted to *Kātyāyana* for certain grammatical terms as well as materials. As naturally follows *Kātyāyana*, the author of the *Vāj. pr.* cannot be identified with *Kātyāyana*, the author of the *Vārttikasūtras*, which were later supplements to the grammar of Pāṇini. So Weber presumes that they were absolutely different persons, but they might have been followers of the same school i. e. the school of the Katās.

Now it should be stated at the very beginning that Weber is not the solitary figure to maintain such a belief. Similar ideas have been expressed also by Roth and Max Müller. Max Müller, of course, does not subscribe to the view that the author of the *Vāj. pr.* was different from the author of the *Vārttikas-sūtras*: so according to him the authors of the two works were one and the same person. Such a premise demands the assumption that both Pāṇini and *Kātyāyana* were contemporaneous. In fact Max Müller has done this and placed both of them sometime about 350 B. C. According to him in point of chronology the *Vāj. pr.* comes first, then comes the grammar of Pāṇini and finally appears the text on the *Vārttika-sūtras* (Pāṇini by Goldstucker, pp 148 ff).

There are certain facts, which compel one to assume the influence of one work upon the other and contacts between them. Weber, who surmises the indebtedness of Pāṇini to the *Vāj. pr.* advances certain arguments in support of his proposition. These are not sufficiently convincing and do not appear adequate to set aside the arguments of the opponents. These are the following :—

(1) The *Vāj. pr.* possesses certain technical terms which are found exactly in the grammatical text of Pāṇini, e.g. *tiñ* I, 27 *āñ* VI, 24, *luk* III, 12 *lup* I, 114, the use of *t* in *et*, *ot* I, 114, IV, 58. These are algebraic in nature. Among the non-algebraic are *upapadam* VI, 14, 23, *yadvṛttam* VI, 14, *naudeśa* I, 143, *dhātu* V, 10 *anyataratas* V, 15, *liṅga* gender IV, 170 and *saṃjñā*. But unlike the *Ath. pr.* the *Vāj. pr.* does not agree entirely with Pāṇini so far as its use of the technical terms is concerned. It possesses a large number of such terms, which are peculiarly its own.

(2) There are certain *sūtras* (mostly *Paribhāṣās*) in the *Vāj. pr.*, which appear exactly in Pāṇini or show slight modifications from those of Pāṇini, e.g. *tasminiti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya* *Vāj. pr.* I, 134. *Pāñ. I. 1. 66* ; -*tasmād ity uttarasyādeḥ* *Vāj. pr.* I, 135. *Pāñ. I. 1. 67* (without *ādeḥ*) ; -*śaṣṭhī sthāne-yogā* *Vāj. pr.* I, 136. *Pāñ. I. 1. 49* ; - *saṃkhyōtānām ānudeśo yathāsaṃkhyam* *Vāj. pr.* I, 143 *yathāsaṃkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām* *Pāñ. I. 3. 10* ; *vīpra-tiṣedha uttaram balabad alope* I, 159 *vīpratiṣedhe param kāryam* *Pāñ. I. 4. 2* ;

varṇasyādarśanam lopāḥ Vāj. pr. I, 141 Pāṇ. I. 1. 60 (without varṇasya) ; -uccair udāttah, nccair anudāttah, ubhayavān svaritah I, 108-110, Pāṇ. I. 2. 29-31 (where samāhārah stands for ubhayavān) :-tasyādita udāttā svarārdhamātram Vāj. pr. I, 126. Pāṇ. I. 2. 32 (where ardhahrasvan only) etc.

(3) The pronunciation of short *a* became so much closed at the time of Pāṇini that the latter considered the short vowel *u* as the norm for the remaining vowels ; *Vāj. pr.* (and also the *Ath. pr.*) considered the same short vowel *a* as the norm, which was assumed to retain its closeness (i.e. *samvṛtatā*) fully.

These are evidences, which impel Weber to believe that Pāṇini was later than the *Vāj. pr.*, upon which he fell back for materials and technique. It should be stated here that there were some who supported Weber and accepted his proposition. Among them one might find also Liebich, Breloer and Keith, whose support to Weber's theory has enabled it to gain in additional strength. But the views of Weber have been bitterly criticised by a galaxy of scholars, among whom we find Goldstücker, Haug, Burnell, Wackernagel, Macdonell and Thieme. All of them maintain that Pāṇini is earlier than the *Vāj. pr.* According to Goldstücker Pāṇini preceded not only the *Vāj. pr.* but also the remaining Prātiśākhya. He believed that Kātyāyana, who composed the *Vāj. pr.* was also the author of the *Vārttikasūtras* and in point of chronology the Prātiśākhya was earlier than the commentary work. The *Vāj. pr.*, according to his surmise, had the double aim of being a Vedic treatise on the phonetics and grammar of the *Vāj. Saṃhitā* as well as of containing criticisms on the *sūtras* of Pāṇini.

P. Thieme has more elaborately discussed the problem and met with an argument of Liebich, which was instituted by the latter in support of the view that Pāṇini was later than Kātyāyana, the author of the *Vāj. pr.* By a study of the *sūtras* of both Liebich stated that the rules of the *Vāj. pr.* were careless and diffuse but those of Pāṇini were as if hewn out of stone and this difference in style was calculated to indicate the priority of the Prātiśākhya to the grammatical text of Pāṇini.

Thieme suggests that such a conclusion, as Liebich has drawn, does not follow from the condition of styles, as described with regard to those two texts. The diffuseness and careless arrangement, which have been spoken with regard to the Prātiśākhya, are in fact the products of attempts to simplify the technicalities of the work and make the same understandable to the readers. He shows that in agreement with the *Ath. pr.*, which is decidedly later than Pāṇini, the *Vāj. pr.* avoids the *pratyāhāras* formed with alphabets and symbolical sounds and introduces more clear expressions free from ambiguities as their substitutes. For example we may state that the *Vāj. pr.* uses *Kavarga* for *Ku* of Pāṇini, *akāra* for *a* and like the *Ath. pr.* avoids altogether the technical terms *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*, which are expressed with the help of specific sounds in individual cases.

These attempts for simplification and precision may yet be distinctly felt by a comparison of the rules of both, which are very close to each other and some of which have already been mentioned by Weber as evidences in support of the priority of the

Vāj. pr. For *samāhāraḥ svaritaḥ* (I. 2. 3') of Pāṇini the *Vāj. pr.* possesses *ubhayavān svaritaḥ* (I, 110): now this definition of Pāṇini is somewhat cumbrous as the word *samāhāra* 'aggregation' indicates the aggregation of the qualities of vowels, which, of course, does not follow from the context, as the latter presents merely the vowels and not their qualities. But this ambiguity has been nicely avoided in the definition presented by the *Vāj. pr.* This becomes quite clear from the statement of Patañjali, who says: *udāttaguṇaḥ udāttāḥ anudāttaguṇo' nudāttāḥ ya idānīmubhayavān sa tṛtīyāmākhyāṃ labhate svaritaḥ iti*.

One or two more examples may be taken for clarification of the point. For *tulyāsyaprayatnam savarṇam* of Pāṇini (I. 1. 19) the *Vāj. pr.* possesses *samānasthānakaraṇāsyaprayatnaḥ savarṇaḥ* (I, 43). Now the definition of Pāṇini is faulty, as it attributes homogeneity to two sounds, which are produced from two different places of articulation, but are the results of the same action. According to this definition both sounds *b* and *j* would be homogenous, as they are the results of explosion, though the former originates from the lips and the latter from the palate. But this defect has been removed from the definition of the *Vāj. pr.* according to which a sound, which is produced by the same passive organ and the same action of the mouth, is called homogenous. Again for Pāṇini's *mukhanāsikāvacaṇo' nunāsikaḥ* (I. 1. 8) the *Vāj. pr.* has read *mukhanāsikākaraṇo' nunāsikaḥ* (I. 75). The substitution of the word *karaṇa* 'active organ of articulation' for *vacana* of Pāṇini is definitely an improvement, as the latter is vague and unsuitable for indicating a technical term like the region of phonetic articulation. From all these considerations P. Thieme believes Pāṇini to be earlier than the author of the *Vāj. pr.*: because he, who comes later, always enjoys the benefit of making improvements upon the composition of the predecessor.

Scholars who support Goldstücker, Haug etc become so much enthusiastic that in admitting priority of Pāṇini to the *Vāj. pr.* they attribute later age to all the Prātiśākhya-texts, which is in fact in conformity with the view of Goldstücker. Such a tendency has been well expressed in the words of Suryakanta, who, states in his introduction to the *Ath. pr.* 'It is therefore practically certain that the *Ath. pr.* in its extant form, was composed later than Pāṇini, but before Patañjali.

With the question of the age of the *Ath. pr.* the question of *Vājasaneyiprātiśākhya's* age is automatically solved. Liebhich himself puts *T. pr. CA* and *RT* after Pāṇini. There remains only one Prātiśākhya i. e. the *Ṛkpr.*; this also contains rules like 4. 98 317 and is certainly not free from contradiction and diffuseness. It seems in these circumstances more reasonable to place all the available Prātiśākhyas as a class after Pāṇini"

(Introduction p. 65)

When the relation between the *Vāj. pr.* and Pāṇini remains unsolved it is very difficult to accept all these statements of Suryakanta to be true—far less his placing the date of the former between Pāṇini and Patañjali. It should be noted here that Suryakanta in the above statement has ignored absolutely the archaic features of the *Ṛkpr* and his

statement stands in glaring contrast to the view of Burnell, who maintains : "It appears to me that for these reasons, Prof. Goldstücker's arguments that the *Prātiśākhya*s are more recent than Pāṇini and are intended to supplement his grammar, do not apply to the *Ṛkpr.* ; of it we probably have a revision subsequent to Pāṇini, but there can be little doubt, the greater part of the text and the matter contained in this work are far older" (The Aindra school of Sanskrit grammarians, p. 85).

From the discussions of the views of the two opponent groups of scholars it becomes evident that the problem regarding the relation between Pāṇini and the *Vāj. pr.* and their respective chronology has not been finally settled. No evidence has been found too conclusive to hold brief for either of the views. In such a condition we have got no other alternative than to wait for more convincing evidences, which might appear sometime as a result of vigorous investigations into the different aspects of the problem.

Next it should be noted that Weber has suggested the work to be a composition of the east. But he had not made any attempt to support his statement with any evidence, nor has he tried to ascertain definitely the particular region, which could lay claim over the work exclusively. But at the same time this statement of Weber has not been contradicted by any body at any time. Rather it has been tacitly assumed to be a fact by Paul Thieme, who has once based his statement upon such a surmise (Pāṇini and the Veda pp 81-82).

Weber has unhesitatingly expressed the view that the last two chapters of the *Vāj. pr.* are later interpolations. As the statement deserves consideration we intend to present his evidences here, which he has not given in the introduction but placed as foot-notes to the explanation of some the *sūtras*.

(1) In the first *sūtra* of the seventh chapter the root *garh* preceded by the prefix *pasri* has been used in a sense in which the use of the same is not found in any other place of the *Vāj. pr.* ; but this peculiar use is quite usual in the *Ṛk. pr.* In the present case it may be assumed that the *Vāj. pr.* borrowed this unusual use of the root from the *Ṛkpr.* Further in the *Vāj. pr.* VIII 54, 55 there occurs a verse which is found verbatim in the *Paṭala* XII of the *Ṛkpr.*

(2) The *Varṇa-samāmnāya*, which has been suggested in 1, 33 and given in details in the following *sūtras*, has got similarity with that which has been provided in the eighth chapter. But the disagreement between them is not inconsiderable. The eighth chapter introduces not only those matters, that have been supplied by the first, but also presents many repetitions and unhomogenous phenomena that do not retain congruity with what we find in the first. Further the eighth chapter possesses many *ślokas* whose style does not agree with that of the *sūtras* of this work. But all these incongruities may be easily attributed to a later insertion of the chapter.

(3) The *sūtras* VIII, 45-46 suggest that the sounds *l, ḷh jihvāmuliya, upadhmānya* and the *nāsikyās* do not occur in the respective *Samhitā* according to the *Mādhyamīna* school. Now the author seems to agree partly with this, as he admits that the sounds *l, ḷh* can appear only according to some, he being obviously not in favour of their acceptance

(IV, 143). But so far as the rejection of the sounds *jihvāmuliya* and the *upadhmāniya* he cannot agree with the Mādhyamīnas, who in this matter have given support to the view of Śākaṭāyana as against Śākalya. So Weber believes that it was the Mādhyamīnas, who introduced this *sūtra* into the body of the text, which originally lacked it and it was so done with a view to making the work the *Vaj. pr.* suitable to their school. Weber further believes that if the author actually composed this *sūtra*, he would not have pushed it to a dark corner of the last chapter but contrarily would have thrown a flood of light upon it. He draws our attention to another phenomenon also. The mention of the Mādhyamīna school in the *sūtra*, according to his belief, is not in conformity with the practice of the author. Whenever he has referred to the view of a different authority or a school he has ascribed the same to the indefinite expression 'eke'—which might represent both the school and the personality. Only in rare cases the authorities like Śākalya, Śākaṭāyana, Gārgya, Jātūkarnya, etc. have been mentioned by their names. So the author did not mention the Mādhyamīna school by its name, consequently the *sūtra*, which embodied it, could not descend from the pen of the author.

Now the above facts convince Weber that both the seventh and the eighth chapters are later interpolations. It is to be noted that this view of Weber has not been contradicted by any body. Burnell has supported this as it agrees with his general proposition that the Prātiśākhya as a class are the products of gradual development and not the results of instantaneous composition. So with regard to the *Vāj. pr.* he states : "Prof. Weber considers that chapters VII and VIII are accretions to the original text ; they are obviously intended to make the text of more general application. The Prātiśākhya appears to have originally been intended for the Kāṇva recension of the *White Yajurveda*, but now includes references to the Mādhyamīna recension also." (The Aindra school of Sanskrit Grammarians, p. 86).

The arguments of Weber need scrutiny and further investigations. It may be that some of the *sūtras* of the respective chapters (i. e. VII and VIII) might be interpolations and not all the *sūtras*. The future investigations alone might throw light upon the problem.

VAJASANEYI PRATISAKHYA

Translated by
S. N. GHOSAL

CHAPTER I

1. *Svarasaṃskārayo-śchandasi niyamaḥ.*

Trans : The accent and the phonetic modifications, which we are going to treat here, are based upon the Chandas.

Note :—Saṃskāra means the arrangement of separate words in the form of the Saṃhitā. Such words stand individually in the padapāṭha and retain their original accent. In the Saṃhitā the original accent undergoes transformation.

2. *laukikānāmarthapūrvakatvāt.*

Trans : But there is restriction with regard to the application of the Chandas, because the words, pronounced by the people in normal life, are uttered with some purpose in view (while the daily study of the Chandas is made with a view to acquiring the spiritual elevation).

3. *na samatvāt.*

Trans : But this restriction with regard to the application of the Chandas is not proper, because the Vedic words are exactly like those, which one pronounces in the ordinary life.

4. *syādvāmnāyadharmitvācchandasi niyamaḥ.*

Weber reads :

syād, āmnāyadharmitvācchandasi niyamaḥ.

Trans : Of course this restriction with regard to the application of the Chandas should occur, because it maintains the features of the holy tradition (i.e, Chandas retains the characteristics of the Veda, which is to be recited daily).

Note : The commentary of Uvaṭa takes syāt not as a separate sentence, as Weber has done, but construes it with the following. So according to the commentary the word syāt should stand as having niyamaḥ as its subject.

5. *yattanna.*

Trans : If you do not know what the nature of sound is (you can know it from what I state in the Prātiśākhya).

6. *vāyuh khāt.*

Trans : Breath comes from the space.

Note : Weber translates kha as glottis. He states : “Ich ziehe vor das Wort kha

hier im Sinne von *kaṇṭhasya kha* zu fassen."

Trans : I prefer to assume the word *kha* as *kaṇṭhasya kha*.

7. *śabdastat*.

Trans : That is transformed into sound.

8. *saṅkaropahitaḥ*.

Weber reads : *saṅkaropa*

Trans : If it be attended with the friction (of the vocal organs).

Note : Weber believes that the sūtra is ungrammatical ; so he states : "Diese Regel ist, ebenso wie die folgenden bis 24, merkwürdig elliptisch, und eigentlich ganz ungrammatisch abgefasst, vgl. 114."

Trans : This sūtra, as also the following upto 24, are evidently elliptical and, in fact, absolutely ungrammatical, cf. 114.

9. *sa saṅghātādīn vāk*.

Trans : It is transformed into voice when it appears in human beings through concentration (pressure) and others.

Note : cf. *Taitt*. XXII. 3.

varṇaprākṭaḥ śabdo vāca utpattih |

Rk Pr. Paṭ. XIII, 5 (4 ?) *vāyuh prāṇaḥ | prayokturihāguṇa-saṁnipāte varṇibhavan guṇaviśeṣayogāt/ekah śrutih karmanāpnoti vahvīh. |*

Trans : As a consequence of the influence of the desire of the speaker upon the relevant factors, one obtains a breath, which develops into sounds i. e. expressions of various natures, through multifarious combinations of different factors.

10. *trīṇi sthānāni*.

Trans : There are three places of the breath (which produces sounds).

11. *dve karaṇe*.

Trans : There are two ways (contraction and opening).

Note : cf. the *Rk Pr*. Paṭ. XIII.

vāyuh prāṇaḥ koṣṭhamanupradānam

kaṇṭhasya khe vivṛte saṁvṛte vā |

āpadyate śvāsātām nādatām vā

vaktrihāyāmubhayaṁ vāntarobhau |

Trans : As a result of the contraction of the fissure of the throat or its opening, as the speaker desires, the breath within the body becomes transformed into the loud noise (as of the tenues) or the clear sound (as of the vowels and sonants) or a mean between the two (as of the sonant-aspirates and h).

12. *śarīrāt*.

Trans : And indeed as it rises from the body.

13. *śarīram*.

Trans : It obtains a (special) body (in the form of a sound).

14. *śārīre*. Weber reads *śārīre*.

Trans : Specially by the way that it gets contact with a (fixed) part of the body (organ).

15. *teṣāṁ samūhāt sa udayā-straikālyam.*

Trans : Rising from the totality of these factors it serves the purpose of all that which fills the three periods (i.e. the present, past and the future).

16. *omkāraḥ svādhyāyādaḥ. Weber omkāraḥ*

Trans : The word om is always to be pronounced at the beginning of the study of a chapter of the Veda.

17. *omkāraṁ athakārau.*

Trans : The word om and the word atha serve the same purpose.

18. *omkāraṁ vedeṣu.*

Trans : The word om is to be employed while studying the Veda.

19. *athakāraṁ bhāṣyeṣu.*

Trans : The word atha is to be pronounced while reading the exegetical works.

Note : Weber's translation deserves consideration, which reads : "das Wort atha bei der bhāṣā angehörigem Werken."

Trans : The word atha is to be applied with regard to the works, belonging to the bhāṣā. It refers possibly to works, which are written in the Classical Sanskrit. Bhāṣā subsequently meant the spoken tongue particularly the correct interpretation.

20. *prayataḥ.*

Trans : One (who would read the Veda,) must be pure.

21. *śucau*

Trans : One must study the Veda in a pure place.

22. *iṣṭam.*

Trans : He should place himself in a convenient seat.

23. *ṛtuṁ prāpya.*

Trans : One should read in a proper time (i.e. the season Hemanta).

24. *yojanānna param.*

Trans : One should not proceed more than the distance of a yojana (while reciting the Veda).

25. *bhojanaṁ madhuraṁ snigdham*

Trans : He should take a sweet and oily food.

26. *varṇadoṣavikārārtham.*

Trans : For the avoidance of inaccuracy in the pronunciation of individual sounds.

27. *tiṅkṛttaddhitacatuṣṭayasamāsāḥ śabdamayam.*

Trans : Verbs, the words formed by the employ of the primary and the secondary suffixes, and the four kinds of compounds have got sounds as their constituents.

28. *tām vācamōmkāraṁ prachāmaḥ.*

Trans : We enquire to om about the treasure of speech (at the beginning of the Vedic recital).

29. *atha śikṣā-vihitāḥ.*

Trans : Now, follow the subject-matters, which are treated in the Śikṣās.

Note : According to Weber the term Sikṣā does not mean any fixed text but the tradition, which has come down orally.

30. *savanakrameṇorah-kaṇṭhabhrūmadhyāni.*

Trans : The three places of the vocal breath, (which are mentioned in the sūtra 10) are the breast, the throat and the centre of the brows in due order of the three daily sacrifices.

Note : Weber informs us that the recitation of the mantras is different in the three savanas. It is done in a low tone in the morning when the tone is retained within the breast ; in the noon it is louder with milder exertion of the throat ; but in the evening it is done extremely aloud, when the vibration is retained within the forehead. Vide *Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra* III, 1, 3-5 ; IX, 6, 16 ff.

31. *āyāmamārdavābhghātāḥ.*

Trans : The (temporary) retention, the mild exertion and the jerk of the tone are the three modifications, which occur in these places during the pronunciation of the sounds in the three daily sacrifices respectively.

Note : By modification of the voice the commentator understands the rise, fall and drawling of the vocal organ or the tone itself corresponding to the three accents. Weber is reluctant to accept this view. As he opines, there is nothing about the rise and fall of the accent here, but only the modulation of the voice ; the direct evidence comes from the *Taitt. Pr.* XXII 1-3, 9-11 : *śabdah prakṛtiḥ sarvavarṇānām, tasya rūpānyatve varṇānyatvam, tatra śabdadravyānyudāhariṣyāmaḥ|āyāmo dāruṇyamanutā khasyetyuccaiḥkarāṇi śabdasya, anvavasargo mārdavamurutā khasyeti nīcāiḥkarāṇi|mandra-madhyamatārāṇi sthānāni bhavanti /*

Trans : The tone is the basis of all the vocal sounds : when the form of the former changes, so does change the form of the latter. The (temporary) suspension, harshness and slenderness (i.e. contraction of the glottis) make the tone high, while the effusion, softness and breadth (i.e. opening) of the glottis make it deep ; soft tone, half-loud tone and the loud tone are the three places (manners) of the vocal breath. Later similar seven sthānas have been enumerated, among which of course the three, stated just now, are also found : “*atha varṇaviśeṣotpattiḥ anupradānāt saśargāt sthānāt karaṇavinyayāt|jāyate varṇavaiśeṣyam parimāṇācca pañcamāt|iti hi varṇaprakṛtaśabdo vāca utpattiḥ|sapta vācaḥ sthānāni bhavanti, upāṁśudhvāna (dhvani) nimadopalabdhiṃmanmandramadhyamatārāṇi | karaṇavadaśabdamaṇaḥprayoga upāṁśu, akṣaravyañjanānāmanupalabdhirdhvāna (dhvaniḥ), upalabdhirnirmadaḥ saśabdamanupalabdhimat, urasi mandram kaṇṭhe madhyamam śirasi tāram*” /. *Taitt. Pr.* XXIII, 1, 4-12. Now the origin of the different vocal sounds : through explosion (of breath), mixing, through the mouth places (i.e. organs) and the method of formation there develops the difference in sound, fifthly also through the time measure ; the tone, which is mixed with sound in this way, is the origin of the voice. The voice has seven places : toneless, sonorous, perceptible, understandable, low half-aloud, loud : toneless is one, which passess within the mind, which is soundless but is an expression indicating the mode of formation ; sonorous is one, when one cannot distinguish between syllables and consonants ; clear, when such is the case ; understandable, when one hears the sounds ; low, when the tone is in the breast ; half-aloud, when it is in the throat ;

loud, when it sounds in the vault of the head. The last three places are mentioned in our sūtra.

32. *uccanīcaviśeṣaḥ.*

Trans : Indeed here is the distinction according to the rise and fall of the tone.

Note : Weber does not agree with the commentator ; according to the latter the sūtra refers to the svarita accent, which is in fact the combination of the rise and fall of the tone.

33. *athākhyāḥ samāmnāyādhikāḥ prāgrīhitāḥ.*

Trans : Now follow the names, which extend beyond those, that are already counted and which are before the rīhita. (160).

Note : Here the expression samāmnāya suggests an enumeration of the samjñā ; but that such an enumeration is not exactly that, which is made in VIII, 1 ff, will be known in due course. Such ākhyās, which can be supposed from the samāmnāya but have not actually been mentioned, stand as svara, sparsā, antaḥsthāḥ, ūṣman, visarjanīya, nāsikya and some more.

34. *upadiṣṭā varaṇāḥ.*

Trans : Such sounds are called the varaṇas, which have been enumerated in the samāmnāya.

35. *antyādvārṇāt pūrva upadhā.*

Trans : The term upadhā indicates the sound, which precedes the last one.

36. *nirdeśa itinā.*

Trans : The mention of sounds is to be made by annexing iti to them.

37. *kāreṇa ca.*

Trans : Also by adding the term kāra.

38. *avyavahitena vyañjanasya.*

Trans : The mention of the consonants is made with the utterance of the same (i.e. the term kāra), only the latter is preceded by the vowel a.

39. *ra ephena.*

Trans : The sound r is pronounced by adding epha to itself (i.e. to r).

40. *svarairapi.*

Trans : There is mentioning of consonants also by vowels, which are tagged to the former.

Note : Weber transposes the sūtras 39 and 40.

41. *nānusvārayamavisarjanīyajihvāmūliyopadhmānīyāḥ.*

Trans : The anusvāra, yama, visarjanīya jihvāmūliya and the upadhmānīya are not to be pronounced by the annexation of the term kāra (or any other) to them (but are to be mentioned by their own names).

42. *dantasya mūrdhanyāpattiranatiḥ.*

Trans : The transformation of a dental sound to a cerebral one is known as nati.

43. *samānasthānakaraṇāsyaprayatnaḥ savarṇaḥ.*

Trans : An alphabet is called a savarṇa, which possesses the same place, the same mode of articulation and the same mouth movement in common with another.

Note : cf. the second *Vārttika* to *Pāṇini* I.1.9.

44. *simādito'ṣṭau svarāṇām.*

Trans : The eight vowels (i.e. a, ā, i, ī, u, ū, ṛ, ṝ), which stand at the beginning (of the varṇasamāmnāya) are known as sim technically.

Note : In the later varṇa-samāmnāya VIII.1 the trimātras are also enumerated : Here Uvaṭa says : *iha tu teṣām grahaṇam na bhavati prayojanābhāvāt trimātrān svayameva vakṣyati* (namely in II. 50-53). *savarṇadīrghatvam ca saṃjñākaraṇe prayojanam, na ca svarṇadīrghatvamuktānām plutānām sambhavati | ataḥ plutāḥ na gṛhyante |* The pluta vowels, which are cursorily mentioned (II 50-53 and VIII 46) do not show the lengthening of two of their kinds ; so they should not be mentioned here or counted among the sim. Hence the latter includes vowels only, which can manifest a vocalic combination i.e. lengthening (IV. 50). This varṇasamāmnāya, which remained before our author, is different from that, which lay before the author of VIII.46. The varṇa-samāmnāya here (44, 45) agrees with that of the *Ṛk Prātiśākhya*, which considers the vowel ḷ as one among the simple vowels and diphthongs, since as a vowel it can stand only in the interior (comp. 87, 69, IV, 110, 57a).

Weber points out that sim comes from sima, which develops from the word sama. The etymology appears doubtful from the standpoint of meaning.

45. *sandhyakṣaram param.*

Trans : The rest are called the diphthongs (i.e. e, ai, o, au).

Note : The name does not occur in the varṇasamāmnāya, which is assumed in the sūtra 33 ; otherwise this would not have been stated here. The varṇasamāmnāya VIII, 8 possesses this, which is a further evidence of its absence in 33.

46. *akanṭhyo bhāvin.*

Trans : Every vowel, which is not kanṭhya, is called bhāvin (i.e. all the vowels barring the kanṭhya i.e. a and ā are known as bhāvin).

Note : The commentator Uvaṭa recognises both the sounds ḷ and ḹ as bhāvin : but Ananta-bhaṭṭa omits them. Weber considers bhāvin to be identical with the term nāmin, which other Prātiśākhyas have done i.e. *yo bhāvayati* i.e. *nāmayati* who causes (i.e. calls forth) bhāva i.e. nati.

47. *vyañjanaṃ kādi.*

Trans : Those, of which ka stands at the beginning, are known as consonants.

Note : Since it stands in the samāmnāya VIII.14 it does not occur in the samāmnāya, mentioned in the sūtra 33.

48. *anantaraṃ saṃyagaḥ.*

Trans : When a consonant comes immediately after another the combination is known as saṃyoga.

49. *sparśeṣveva saṃkhyā.*

Trans : Enumeration takes place only with regard to the sparśas.

50. *dvau dvau prathamau jit.*

Trans : The first two sparśas of each varga are known as jit (i.e. k, kh, c, ch, ṭ, ṭh, t, th, p, ph).

51. *uṣmāṇśca hivarjam*

Trans : The sibilants barring h are also known as jit.

Note : The commentator has forgotten to mention that the vowel i of hi is silent. Here the sibilants and h come under uṣman. The *Pāṇiniyaśikṣā* gives a different order, according to which the sound o from aḥ, hitaus between two vowels and r are also included within the term uṣman. H is omitted there, so also visarga, if not reduced to o. The verse reads :

*obhāvaśca vivṛttiśca śaśasā repha eva ca |
jihvāmūlamupadhmā ca gatiḥ aṣṭavidhoṣmaṇaḥ |*

The *Ṛk Prātiśākhya* (I, 12) knows 8 kinds of uṣman, since it reckons anusvāra, visarga, h, along with ś, ṣ, s, ḥk and ḥp as such.

52. *mucca*.

Trans : Besides, these are known also as mud (i.e. the three sibilants also bear the technical name mud).

53. *dhi śeṣaḥ*.

Trans : The rest (i.e. the remaining 20 consonants, namely the last three of each varga, y, r, l, v and h) are known as dhi.

54. *dvītiyacaturthāḥ soṣmāṇaḥ*.

Trans : The second and the fourth consonants (of a varga i. e. aspirates) are called soṣman.

Note : The *Ṛk-Prātiśākhya* knows the terms soṣmon (I, 13), so also the *Ath.pr.* (I. 11. 94).

55. *amātrasvaro hrasvaḥ*.

Trans : A vowel, which has the measure of the vowel a, is known as short.

Note : For the rules 55-59 compare the *Ath. Pr.* I, 51-54, 49-62 “*hrasvaṃ laghva-samyoge/gurvanyat/anunāsikaṃ ca/padānte ca/ekamātro hrasvaḥ/vyañjanāni ca/dvimātro dīrghaḥ/trimātraḥ plutaḥ*” Trans : A short vowel is light if not combined with another. The rest is heavy (long). So also are the anunāsika and one at the end of the pada. A light sound is constituted of one mātrā. So are the consonants. A long sound is comprised of two mātrās. The pluta contains three mātrās.

56. *mātrā ca*.

Trans : It goes also as mātrā.

Note : About the time of the mātrā the *Pāṇiniya-śikṣā* in the *Ṛk* recension v.49 makes the comparison with the voice of the animals :

*cāṣastu vadate mātrām dvimātraṃ tveva vāyasaḥ |
śikhī rauti trimātraṃ tu nakulastvārdhamātrakam ||*

The verse is quoted from the concluding portion of the Paṭala XIII of the *Ṛk Pr*, where it occurs as :

cāṣastu vadate mātṛm̐ dve mātṛe vāyaso' vṛavīṣṭ /
śikhī trimātṛo vijñeya eṣa mātṛā-parigrahaḥ ||

57. *dvistāvān dīrghaḥ.*

Trans : When a sound requires double the time (for being pronounced) it is known as long.

58. *plutastrīḥ*

Trans : When a sound requires three times the time (for being pronounced) it is known as pluta.

59. *vyāñjanamardhamātra.*

Trans : A consonant goes for half a mātṛā (e.g. the consonant ṇ in prāṇ and pratyāṇ seems to have the value of half mātṛā).

60. *tadardhamāṇu.*

Trans : The half-mātṛā of the half-mātṛā (i.e. of a consonant) is called aṇu. (cf IV. 146).

61. *paramānvardhamātra.*

Trans : The half of an aṇu-matra is known as paramāṇu (i.e. one-eighth mātṛā).

Note : It does not appear in the text. It corresponds to the time-measure of dhruvam of the *Ṛk.Pr.* according to Weber.

62. *sthāne.*

Trans : The following refers to the place, where the sounds are pronounced.

63. *hrasvagrahaṇe dīrghaplutau pratiyāt.*

Trans : When one mentions a short vowel the long and the extended ones of the same are also to be understood.

64. *prathamagrahaṇe vargam.*

Trans : When one mentions the first consonant one should understand all the consonants of the varga.

65. *ṛḥkau jihvāmūle.*

Weber *ṛṣkkau jihvāmūle.*

Trans : The vowel ṛ ḥk (the jihvāmūliya) and the gutturals have their place at the root of the tongue.

Note : The *Ṛk. Pr.* include here also the vowel ḷ. But the *Pāṇinīyaśikṣā* omits the sounds ṛ and ḷ. So it suggests :

jihvāmūle tu kuḥ proktaḥ

Trans : Here ku represents both the gutturals and the jihvāmūliya.

66. *icaśeyāstālau.*

Trans : The vowel i, the palatals, ś, e and y are pronounced in the palate.

Note : The *Ṛk.Pr.* includes also the vowel ai here (Paṭ.I.19) so also the *Śāṅkhyāyana Śrantaśūtra* I,2,5 : the Śikṣā omits the vowel e, as it states *icuyaśā stālavāḥ*.

67. *ṣaṭaumūrdhani.*

Trans : Ṣ and the linguals are pronounced in the roof of the palate.

Note : *Ṛk. Pr.* agrees here but the Śikṣā suggests : *syu mūrdhanyā ṛṭuraṣāḥ*.

68. *ro dantamūle.*

Trans : R is to be pronounced at the root of the teeth.

Note : Weber translates : “r an der Zungenwurzel” :

Trans : R is to be pronounced at the root of the tongue. We do not understand why danta should be translated as tongue (Zunge). It might be an oversight of Weber. So also the *Ath Pr.* I.27 : *rephasya dantamūlāni.*

69. *ḷlasitā dante.*

Trans : ḷ, l, s, and the dental consonants (i.e. stops) are to be pronounced in the teeth.

Note : According to the *Rk Pr.* Paṭ 1,19,20 these are to be pronounced at the root of the teeth (dantamūle) excluding ḷ, which is considered as jihvāmūliya. But the Śikṣā agrees with the present Prātiśākhya, as it states :

dantyaḥ ḷtulasāḥ smṛtāḥ.

70. *uvopopadhmā oṣṭhe.*

Weber reads *uvoṣpapā oṣṭhe.*

Trans : u, v, o, the labial consonants and the upadhmāniya are to be pronounced at the lips.

Note : The *Rk Pr.* also adds along with it the vowel au. So also the *Śāṃkhyāyana Śrautasūtra* I.25. The Śikṣā (24) includes only the vowel u and the labials *oṣṭhajāvupū* within this class. For o and au it suggests *kaṇṭhoṣṭhajau* (cf 73) and for v it says *dantoṣṭhyo vaḥ smṛto vudhaiḥ* (cf 84).

71. *ahavisarjaniyāḥ kaṇṭhe.*

Trans : The sounds a, h and the visarjaniya are to be pronounced at the throat.

Note : So indeed in the *Rk Pr.* (Paṭ I.18). There is agreement of the śikṣā also, which states *kaṇṭhyāvahau* (24).

72. *savarṇavacca.*

Trans : Here the vowel a is to be treated as of being similar to ā (though the vowel a is saṃvṛta, while ā is vivṛta).

Note : The distinction between saṃvṛta a (covered) and vivṛta ā (open) does not seem to have appeared in the *Rk Pr.* But the *Ath. Pr.* recognises it (I,35) so does Pāṇini (VIII.4.68) cf. the commentary there and also at the sūtra I.1.9. Here Weber suggests that the short a developed a covered heavy pronunciation at the time of the composition of these three works and it explains its easy transformation into e and o in Pāli. But the transformation of a into ā did not become effective so completely at the time of the *Vāj. Pr.* as at the time of Pāṇini, so much so that the former considers a as the norm of the vowel, while the latter u.

73. *aikāraukārayoḥ kaṇṭhyā pūrvā mātrā tālvoṣṭhayoruttarā.*

Trans : Of ai and au the first mātrā is to be pronounced in the throat but the second in the palate (in the case of ai) and the lips (in the case of au).

Note : The following statement of the *Rk Pr.* is to be observed :

sandhyāni sandhyakṣarāṇyāhureke
dvisthānataiteṣu tathobhayeṣu ||
sandheṣvakāro'rdhvamikāra uttarām
yujerukāra iti śākaṭāyanah |
mātrāsamsargādavare' pṛthakśruti
hrasvānusvāravatyatiṣaṅgavat pare | Paṭ. XIII 15-16

The above verses suggest that the diphthongs are the products of the combinations of two sounds, which are pronounced from two different organs of the mouth. According to Śākaṭāyana in the case of e, ai the first half is constituted of a and the second of i, while in the case o, au the first half is constituted of a and the second of u. But others consider that such distinctions between two separate vowels becoming diphthongs cannot be made.

74. *yamānusvāranāsikyānām nāsike.*

Trans : The nose is the organ of pronunciation of the yamas, the anusvāra and the nāsikya.

Note : The *Rk Pr.* suggests it by stating
nāsikyān nāsikyayamānusvārān
iti sthānānyatra yamopadeśah | Paṭ. I.20

75. *mukhanāsikākaraṇo'nunāsikah.*

Trans : A sound (i.e. a vowel or a semivowel except r) is anunāsika, when it is pronounced simultaneously from the mouth and the nose.

Note : The *Ath. Pr.* I.26 states :
anunāsikānām mukhanāsikam.

76. *dantya jihvāgrakaraṇāḥ.*

Trans : The dentals are to be pronounced with the tip of the tongue.

Note : cf. the *Ath Pr.* I.23
dantyanām jihvāgram prastīrṇam.

77. *raśca.*

Trans : So also r.

78. *mūrdhanyāḥ prativeṣṭyāgram.*

Trans : The cerebrals are to be pronounced by turning the tip of the tongue.

Note : Weber's translation seems to be a bit round about. He translates : "die Lingualen durch Bedeckung der Zwingenspitze (indem man dieselbe an das Gaumendach so anschliesst, dass sie durch dieses bedeckt wird)".

Trans : The linguals are to be pronounced through the covering of the tip of the tongue (now one attaches the same to the roof of the palate in such a manner that it becomes covered with it).

79. *tālusthānā madhyena.*

Trans : The palatals are to be pronounced with the middle of the tongue.

Note : cf. the *Ath Pr.* I.20 *tālavyānām madhyajihvam.*

80. *samānasthānakaraṇā nāsikauṣṭhyāḥ.*

Trans : The nāsikya and labials have got the same organ as the place as well as the means of pronunciation.

Note : The word nāsikya has become a source of confusion to scholars. Here Weber has elaborately discussed about its actual significance and its distinction from the yama. We cite him for a clear understanding of his view point : "Was unter nāsikya hier wie 74 zu verstehen sei, wenn nicht wie Roth zur Lit. pag. 68 und Regnier a. a. O Féxr. pag. 213 wollen, die Nasale der fünf varga, ist zunächst ziemlich rathselhaft, Mit der 'hum' der Schol. hier und des Textes selbst in VIII, 28 scheint wenig anzufangen. Der Name nāsikya kommt in Verlauf des *Vaj. Pr.* nur noch einmal (VIII, 45) vor : dasselbe handelt sonst nur von den fünf Nasalen, dem anusvāra (d.i. vor sibilanten und r) und den anunāsika d.i. nasalischen Vokalen oder Halbvokalen, so wie den yama (über diese so gleich). Gegen jene Auffassung Roth's und Regnier's spricht indes, dass die fünf Nasale sonst stets durch *uttama pañcama* bezeichnet sind, so wie Ferner, dass an jener Stelle des achten Buches (VIII, 45) unter Nāsikya jedenfalls ein ganz besonderer Laut zu verstehen ist. Letztere Stelle könnte nun zwar freilich, da der achte Adhyāya entschieden eine spätere zuthat ist, ebenso wenig wie VIII, 28 für unsere Stellen im ersten Adhyāya beweiskräftig sein : da jedoch auch das *Ṛk Pr.* s, Müller i. 49 mit Nāsikya einen besonderen Laut, nicht die fünf Nasale bezeichnet (Müller scheint am a. a. O darin den durch das zeichen^{*} bezeichneten Laut zu erkennen?) so ist diese Auffassung entschieden vorzuziehen. Die Berliner Handschrift (Chambers 714) des Kommentars zu *Ṛk Pr.* 1,49 erklärt übrigens das Wort in derselben Weise, wie unser Text in VIII,45 nämlich durch 'hum' iti nāsikya : eine zweite Hand hat hum angestrichen und darunter die Worte *nañāṇanamāḥ anunāsikyāḥ* gefügt. Wir müssen also diesem hum etwas näher zu Leibe gehen. Die Bildung dieses Lautes ist ganz identisch mit der von *kum kh. ṁ gum ghum iti yamāḥ* (VIII,29) : von diesen yama aber wissen wir, dass sie nicht durch u von ihrem sparśa (prakṛti) getrennt sind, sondern unmittelbar mit ihm ausgesprochen werden : das u könnte also wohl hier nur zur Bezeichnung des dumpfen Aussprache dienen? oder sollte es, und diese Vermuthung gibt mir Chambers 714 an die Hand, durch einem graphischen Irrtum aus einem untergesetzten ñ entstanden sein? So ist nämlich daselbst, zu *Ṛk Pr.* 1,49, zweimal aus '*kum khum gum ghum ityādayo yamāḥ*' von zeiter Hand mit Ausstreichung des anusvāra Punktes und Verwandlung des u - striches in einem ñ - strich unter Beisetzung des betreffenden Punktes kña khña, gña ghña gemacht worden. Dies scheint in der that die einzig mögliche Art, die wirkliche Aussprache der betreffender yama graphisch wenigstens annähernd richtig wiederzugeben. Nach dieser Analogie hatten wir nun also auch für hum ein hña zu substituieren, und der Nāsikya wäre weiter nichts als eine nasalische Brechung des h vor folgendem Nasal, entsprechend der Brechung der sparśa in ihre yama.

Diese Auffassung, zu der ich bereits durch jene Korrektur von zweiter Hand in Chambers 714 geführt worden war, erhielt unmittelbar darauf ihre directe Bestätigung durch eine Stelle des *Ath. Pr.* I,99, 100, welche keinen Zweifel übrig lässt : *samānapāde'*

nuttamāt sparśād uttame yamairyathāsāṅkhyam hakārān nāsikyena / Wenn in demselben Worte auf einen sparśa, die Nasale ausgenommen, ein Nasal folgt, so werden die Beiden durch die betreffenden yama geschieden; folgt der Nasal auf ein h, durch die Nāsikya. Zbenso heisst es auch in *Taitt. Pr. II,9 sparśād anuttamād uttamaparād ānupūrvyām nāsikyāḥ tām yamān eke, hakārān nṇmaparān nāsikyam* / nach einem nicht nasalischer sparśa dem ein nasalischer folgt, werden die Reihe nach die Nāsikya eingeführt. Einige nennen dieselben yama, und nāsikya nur den nach h vor n, ṇ, m einzufugenden Laut.

Das den Mādhyandina dieser Nāsikya fehlt, lernen wir aus dem Nachtrag zum *Vāj. Pr.* (in VIII,45): aber auch der Verfasser des *Vāj. Pr.* selbst scheint sich IV,161 gegen die Anwendung desselben auszusprechen? oder ist es nur die Brechung der andern Sibilanten (ansser h) die er daselbst tadelt, Es wäre wenigsten sonst auffallig genug, dass er den nāsikya hier wie zu 74 als ganz regelmässig behandelt,—Was nun übrigen unsere Regel (80) hier selbst betrifft, so weiss ich für die darin vorliegende Gleichsetzung des Nāsikya mit den Labialen keine recht genügende Erklärung: das sthānam beider ist ja doch entschieden getrennt, wie der schol auch direct anführt; es kann also von einem *samānam sthānam* eigentlich gar keine Rede sein! der Sinn dahin zu gehen, dass bei den Labialen ausser Lippe auch die Nase, bei dem Nāsikya dagegen ausser der Nase auch die Lippen betheiligt sein?—Das *Ath. Pr. I,24* giebt die unterlippe als hauptsächlich bei der Bildung der Labialen beiteiligt an *oṣṭhyān-āmadharoṣṭham*”

Trans: It is obscure as to what to be understood is by the term Nāsikya here as also in the sūtra 74 if not the nasals of the five Vargas as mentioned by Roth at Lit. p.68 and Regnier at a. a. O Febr. p.213, Little seems to be conveyed by the term *hum*, which appears here in the commentary and also in the text itself of VIII.28. In the entire course of the *Vāj.Pr.* the name nāsikya appears only for once (VI,45): it treats only of the five nasals, the anusvāra (i.e. ĩ before sibilants and r) and the anunāsika i.e. nasal vowels or half-vowels so also the yama (quite unambiguously). Against the assumption of Roth and Regnier it may be stated that the five nasals are so frequently expressed by the terms *uttama*, *pañcama* that in the passages of the 8th Book (VIII.45) the word nāsikya conveys asolutely a different meaning. Since the eighth adhyāya is a later addition the latter passage (i.e. VIII.45) as also VIII. 28 can never be evidences for support of our passages of the first adhyāya: since the *Rk. Pr.* (see Müller I.49) understands by the term nāsikya a special sound and not the five nasals so this view is to be decisively preferred (Müller seems to understand by it a sound marked by the *anunāsika* i.e. ̣) The Berlin manuscript (Chambers 714) of the commentary of the *Rk. Pr.* I.49, however, explains the word in the same way as our text in VIII.45 namely *hum iti nāsikyāḥ*. A second hand has struck off the word *hum* and has added below the expression *ñāṇāṇanamāḥ anunāsikyāḥ*. We should now follow the word a bit more closely. The formation of this sound is quite identical with that of *kum*, *khum*, *gum*, *ghum* *iti yamāḥ* (VIII. 29). About these yamas we know that they are never separated from their sparśas (*prakṛti*) due to their

connection by the vowel u but are immediately pronounced with it : the vowel u could also be used here for the pronunciation of the dull sound or as the suggestion comes to me from Chambers 714 it should have sprung due to a graphic error from an underlined ñ. In the same very place of the *Ṛk Pr.* I.49 twice *kuṃ kḥuṃ guṃ gḥuṃ ityādayaḥ yamāḥ* has been revised into *kña, khña, gña, ghña* etc by a second hand with the removal of the anusvāra point and the change of the u-mark into a ñ-mark with the attribution of the relevant point. In fact this seems to be the only method of representing the real pronunciation of the relevant yama graphically or at least approximately. By this analogy we are to substitute *huṃ* by *hña* and this *nāsikya* was nothing other than the nasal breaking of h before the following nasal corresponding to the breaking of the *sparsā* in their yama. This conception, to which I was led by a correction of the second hand of Chambers 714, finds immediate support from a statement of the *Ath. Pr.* I.99.100, which leaves not a bit of doubt : *samānapadēnut'tamāt sparśād uttame yamair yathāsaṅkhyam/hakārān nāsikyena* / "if in the same word a nasal follows a *sparsā* barring the nasals, both of them are separated by the relevant yama ; if a nasal follows h they are separated by the *nāsikya*". The same view has been expressed by the *Taitt. Pr.* II.9 *sparsād anuttamād uttamapadād ānupūrvyān nāsikyāḥ / tān yamān eke, hakārān naṇamaparān nāsikyam* / "after a nonnasal *sparsā*, followed by a nasal the *nāsikya* is inserted according to the series. Some call it yama, but *nāsikya* only when it comes after h but before n, ṇ or m".

That this *nāsikya* is wanting in the Mādhyamdina school we come to learn from a supplement of the *Vāj. Pr.* (in VIII.45) ; but does the author of the *Vāj. Pr.* seem to speak against the application of the same in IV. 161 ? or is it only the breaking of other sibilants (except h) which he blames there. At least it would appear quite strange that he uses the word *māsikya* in the correct sense here as also in 74.

So far as it concerns our rule here (80) I do not find any justifiable explanation of equalising the *nāsikya* with labials. The *sthānam* of both is decidedly different as the commentator directly shows : so there cannot be properly any talk of '*samānasthānam*'. The sense seems to be that in the pronunciation of the labials besides the lips the nose too has been helpful as in the case of the *nāsikya* besides the nose the lips too have contributed a share. The *Ath. Pr.* I 24 attributes to the lower lip the chief share so far as the pronunciation of the labials is concerned : *oṣṭhyānām adhara uṣṭhyam*.

81. *vo qantāgraiḥ*.

Trans : Va is produced with the tips of the teeth.

82. *nāsikāmūlena yamāḥ*.

Trans : The yamas are produced by the root of the nose.

Note : The word yama has been a source of great confusion to the scholars. As this preceding discussion shows, Weber understands by this a nasal sound that appears after the first four sounds of the *varga* but before a nasal sound. According to this view there can be 20 yamas before twenty sounds of the *vargas*. But statements like *catvāraśca yamāḥ smṛtāḥ* etc. which restrict the number of yamas to four, seem to

contradict the above view. The anamoly, may, however, be removed by taking into consideration the fact that in each varga there are four sounds only, which are entitled to possess the yama and these are referred to. The word nāsikya, with which the term yama is very often confused, indicates the nasal sound that appears after h but before another nasal, as it follows from the previous discussions of Weber. As the latter has given a valuable discussion here we intend to quote a certain portion from the same : "Der schol spricht hier wie zu 74 nur von vier yama ebenso die śikṣā (4) *catvāraśca yamāḥ smṛtāḥ* : auch VIII.29 sind ausdrücklich nur vier yama und zwar bloß die gutturalen Reihe aufgeführt. In seinen eignen Beispielen indess hier, wie zu 103. IV. III. 163-161 führt der Schol auch andere, nicht bloße gutturale yama. Die Regel ferner unsers Textes selbst über die Bildung der yama (IV.160-161) lasst keinen Zweifel darüber, dass wir jedem der 20 nicht nasalischen zwillingslaut, zuzuschreiben haben, vgl *Ṛk Pr.* Müller I.49 und *Ath. Pr.* I.92 *Taitt. Pr.* II.9. (s. oben pag. 123). Wie ist nun dieser Widerspruch zu lösen. Wohl dahin, dass wenn man damit nur den nasalischen Laut bezeichnet der einem jeden der vier ersten sparśa eines varga vor einem Nasal anschmiegt ohne dabei auf die Verschiedenheiten der varga selbst Rücksicht zu nehmen. Es gabe zwei yama für die Tenues, zwei für die Sonantes. Der gutturale varga ware dann in VIII.29 nur exempli causa gewählt ? Müller I.905 Nach den angeführten Stellen dar *Ath. Pr.* and *Taitt. Pr.* ubrigens wird der nasalische Laut nicht dem sparśa vergeschoben (Müller pag. CXXIII) sondern dem nasal, also zwischen sparśa und Nasal eingefügt."

Trans : The commentary speaks here as in 74 only of 4 yamas, so does the śikṣā (4) *catvāraśca yamāḥ smṛtāḥ* : also in VIII.29 expressly 4 yamas have been mentioned and those of the guttural series have been mentioned. In its own examples here as also in 103. IV, III.160-161 the commentary mentions also others - and not merely the guttural yamas. Besides even the rule of our text on the formation of the yama does not leave any doubt that to each of the 20 non-nasal sparśas before a break in a yama - i.e. a twin nasal sound has been ascribed. cf *Ṛk Pr.* Müller I.49, and *Ath. Pr.* I.99, *Taitt. Pr.* II. 9 (see above at the page 123). How to solve this contradiction ? It happens that when one speaks of four yamas one indicates surely the nasal sound that clings to each of the first four sparśas of a varga before a nasal without taking into consideration the different classes of the varga. There were two yamas of the surds and two for the sonants. The guttural varga is casually cited by way of illustration in VIII.29. See about the topic in Müller I.405.—According to the passages of the *Ath. Pr.* and *Taitt. Pr.* the nasal sound does not throw off the sparśa (Müller page CXXIII) and occupy its place but is put between the sparśa and the nasal.

83. *jihvāmūliyanusvārā hanumūlena.*

Trans : The jihvāmūliya (see 65) and the anusvāra are to be pronounced with the root of the jaw.

84. *kaṇṭhyā madhyena.*

Trans : The alphabets of the throat (s.71) are to be pronounced with the middle of the jaw.

Note : Here the *Ath. Pr.* I.18 gives *kanṭhyānāmadharakanṭhyaḥ*.

85. *prathamottamāḥ padāntīyāḥ acñau*.

Trans : Only the first and the last letters (of the five series) excepting c and ñ can stand as the final sound in a word (that is the letters k, ṭ, t, p, ṇ, n, m).

Trans : Pāṇini believes that normally the medial sonant stands at the final syllable of a word (VIII.450) The latter, also the view of Gārgya, contrary to what our sūtra instructs here, goes also for the view of Śākaṭāyana. *Ath. Pr.* agrees with the view, that has been expressed in the sūtra : *sparsāḥ prathamottamāḥ (padyāḥ d.i. padāntīyāḥ bhavanti) | na cavargaḥ/prathamāntāni tṛtīyāntāni śaunakasya pratijñānam na vṛtīḥ*. That the final prathama becomes transformed into tṛtīya is a view of Śaunaka. cf. the observation on III.51.

86. *visarjanīyaḥ*.

Trans : So also the visarjanīya (can stand as the final sound in a word).

87. *svarāśca ṭkāravarjam*.

Trans : The vowels also excepting ṭ can stand as the final sound in a word.

Note : Here one should note the observation of the *Ath. Pr.* I. 5. *anṭkāraḥ svarāḥ padyāḥ* i.e. *padāntīyāḥ*.

88. *nakārarkārāvagrahe*.

Trans : The sounds ṇ and r can retain their features of padāntīya only when they are in the avagraha (i.e. at the end of the first word of a compound split into two components).

89. *anunāsikaścottamāḥ*.

Trans : The last alphabets (of the Vargas i.e. ṇ, ñ, ṇ, n, m) are also called *anunāsikas*.

Note : cf. 75. The *Ath. Pr.* II.2. speaks the same thing : *uttamā anunāsikāḥ*. The *Taitt. Pr.* has made a special investigation into the degree of nasality in the different nasals. It states : *tivratarāmānunāsikyamanusvārōttameṣviti śaityāyaṇaḥ/samā sarvatreti kauhaliputraḥ | anusvāre' ṇviti bhāradvājaḥ | nakārasya rephoṣmayakārabhāvallupte ca malopāc cottaramuttaram tivratarāmiti sthāviraḥ kauṇḍīnyaḥ* (XVII 1-4) |

Trans : 'The nasality is the strongest in the anusvāra and the five nasals'—thus states Śaityāyana. According to the son of Kauhalī it is equal everywhere. According to the Bhāradvāja it is less in the anusvāra. At the elision of n due to its transformation into r in a sibilant or y, so also at the elision of m (obviously not consequent on some kind of transformation) the preceding one is more strongly nasalized than the succeeding according to the view of old Kauṇḍīnya.

90. *sparsāntasya sthānakaraṇavimokṣaḥ*.

Trans : A word ending in a sparsā shows the change of place and also of the mode of articulation (with regard to this sparsā i.e. contact consonant) before another word.

Note : The *Rk Pr.* calls this phenomenon *abhinidhāna* (Paṭ. VI. 5 ff) and so also the *Ath. Pr.* (I. 43-50). The latter states : *vyañjanavidhāraṇam abhinidhānaḥ pīḍitaḥ sannataro hīna-śvāsānadaḥ | sparsē'bhinidhānaḥ | sparsāsya padāntāvagrahayaśca | lakārasyo-*

śmasu ṇaṇanānāmn/hakāre/āsthāpitamca/ato'nyat sāmyuktam/pūrvarūpasya mātrārdham samānakaraṇam param /

Trans : The separate existence of two consonants is called abhinidhāna—deposit : such a sound is pressed, somewhat broken, of little breath (in the case of surds) or tone (in the case of sonants). This abhinidhāna appears in a sparśa, followed by a sparśa, so also at the end of a word or in the avagraha of a word standing as a member of a group. It appears in l, of course, before sibilants and also in ṇ, ṇ, n before h. It is otherwise called 'āsthāpitam' retained (i.e. held up before its completion, broken). In all other combinations of consonants except those, already mentioned, the sāmyoga comes directly. Here indeed the later half-mātrā of the first member shares the mode of reproduction (of the second member). Here the following observation of Weber is to be noted :

“Ausser der von Müller a.a.O besonders hervorgehobenen Einhaltung des Stimmauches ist also mit dem abhinidhāna auch noch eine so bedeutende Modification und Abweichung des Lautes selbst verbunden, dass dieselbe hier in 90 geradezu als ein Vimokṣa, eine ‘Aufgabe’ des sthāna wie des karaṇa desselben bezeichnet wird ; dadurch nähert sich denn auch der Gebrauch des Wortes abhinidhāna für diesen Fall der anderen Verwendung dieses Wortes in Schol. zu IV.61 (vgl. I. 114.115. *Ṛk Pr.* I, 138), wo es für das Einziehen eines a nach e oder o gebraucht wird”.

Trans Besides the retention of breath specially stressed by Müller in a.a.O such a very significant modification and weakening of sound itself are connected with the abhinidhāna that the same is indicated in 90 as the vimokṣa or the renunciation of sthāna as well as of karaṇa of the same : as a result of this the use of the word abhinidhāna approximates itself in this case to a different application in the comm. at IV. 61 (comp. I, 114.125 *Ṛk Pr.* I, 131), where it is used in the sense of contraction of an a to the preceding e or o.

91. *avasāne ca.*

Trans : So in the pause.

Note : cf. the *Ṛk Pr.* Paṭ. VI, 5.

92. *pragṛhyam.*

Trans : The following cases are pragṛhyas (i.e. are to be pronounced with iti in the Padapāṭha).

Note : The following verses of the *Ṛk Pr.* are to be noted :

*akāra āmantritajaḥ pragṛhyah
padam cānyo' pūrva-padāntagaśca /
ṣaṣṭhādayaśca dvivaco' ntabhāja
strayo dīrghāḥ saptamikau ca pūrvvau /
asme yuṣme tve amī ca pragṛhyā
upottamam nānudāttam na padyam /
ukāraścetikaraṇena yukto
rakto'prkto drāghitah śākalena / Paṭ.I, 28-29.*

Trans : If the vowel o be vocative it is *pragṛhya*. The vowel o other than that of the vocative should also be called so. But the vowel o at the end of the first member of the compound should not be considered as such. The vowels ī, ū, and e (lit. those at the beginning of which the sixth vowel stands) become *pragṛhyas*, if they be used in the dual. If the vowels ī and ū are used in the locative they should also be so. The vowels ī and e, which stand at the end of *asme*, *yusme*, *tve* and *amī* should be entitled to the designation of *pragṛhya*. But of these the penultimate i.e. *tve* should be considered as *pragṛhya* if it be *anudātta* and the part of a *pada*. The vowel *u* becomes a *pragṛhya* if it stands alone. But when it is combined with the *anunāsika* and followed by *iti* it becomes long according to the view of Śākala. In the *Ath. Pr.* (I, 73-81) we note the same : *ukārasyetāvapṛktasya dīrghaḥ pragṛhyaśca ikārokārau ca saptamyarthe / dvivacanāntam ekāraśca / asme yusme tve me iti codāttaḥ / amī vahuvacanam / nipāto' pṛkto'nākārah / okārāntaśca / āmantritam cetāvanārṣe /*

Trans : When *u* stands alone it is *pragṛhya* (then it is lengthened and nasalized in the *padapāṭha* before *iti* i.e. *ū[̃] iti*). The vowels ī and ū are such at the end of a loc, so also as duals : in the latter case also *e* ; *e* appears such also when it occurs in the words *asme*, *yusme*, *tve*—and in *me* when it is *udātta*. The vowel ī is *pragṛhya* when it occurs in the word *amī* in the plur. Every *nipāta*, constituted of one sound, is *pragṛhya* except *ā*. All the *nipātas* ending in *o* are to be so considered. The vocative before *iti* of the *Padapāṭha* is also to be considered as *pragṛhya*.

93. *ekārekārokārā dvivacanāntāḥ.*

Trans : Specially *e*, *ī*, *ū*, at the end of words used in the dual should also be considered as *pragṛhyas*.

94. *okāraśca padānte'navagrahaḥ*

Trans : So also *o* at the end of a *pada* but not in *avagraha*.

95. *ukāro'pṛktaḥ.*

Trans : So is also *u*, which stands alone.

Note : It is lengthened before *iti* in the *Padapāṭha* and nasalized. See IV, 87-90.91.

96. *camū asme tve.*

Trans : So also the words *camū*, *asme*, *tve* etc.

97. *me udāttaṃ.*

Trans : The word *me* is also *pragṛhya*, when it is *udātta*.

98. *amī padam.*

Trans : So is *amī*, when it stands as an independent word.

99. *svaro'kṣaram*

Trans : A vowel forms a syllable.

100. *sahādyairvyañjanaiḥ.*

Trans : The vowel forms a syllable along with the consonants, which precede it.

Note : Here Weber makes a very interesting observation. He states : "Der vokal herrscht über die konsonanten, wie der ātman über die aṅga : der Name con-sonans huldigt wohl demselben Princip."

Trans : The vowel predominates over the consonants, as the ātman over the aṅga : the name consonant supports the same principle. So in the *Taitt. Pr.* XXI.1 'vyañjanaṁ svarāṅgam'.

Trans : The consonants are members of the vowels.

101. *uttaraiścāvasitaiḥ.*

Trans : (The vowels are syllables) along with the following consonants, when they stand at the pause.

102. *saṃyogādih pūrvasya.*

Sharma : *saṃyogādih*

Trans : The first consonant of a conjunct group belongs to the preceding vowel.

103. *yamāśca.*

Trans : So also a consonant (which follows the first consonant) belongs to the preceding vowel, provided it is a yama.

Note : The point has been clarified by Uvaṭa who says : *yathā rukkmam / kakāra-dvaya-yama-makārāḥ saṃyogaḥ / tathā kakārayamau pūrvasya, makārāḥ uttarasya /* Weber adds the following observation : "das erste k is dviruktija, das zweite ist das vor m mit einer yamāpatti behaftet k. vgl. Schol. zu IV,III, welches sūtram beweist, dass es sich hier in 103 nur um einer ursprünglich initialen yama resp. dann in 102 nur um den dviruktija des betreffenden saṃyogādi handeln kann."

Trans : The first k is dviruktija, the second before m appears by yamāpatti. cf. Comm. on the sūtra IV.III, which shows that in 103 the originally initial yama has been treated, or in 102 one can find treatment about the dviruktija of the relevant saṃyogādi.

104. *kramajaṃ ca.*

Trans : So also the consonant, which appears by the doubling of the second member of the conjunct-group, stands as a part of the preceding vowel.

Note : Here the comm. of Uvaṭa deserves consideration :

*yathā—pārśśvyam, rephau dvau śakārau
vakāro yakāraśca saṃyogaḥ / tatra
rephaḥ saṃyogādih kramajaśca prathamah
śakārah pūrvāṅgam, dvitīyah śakāro
vakāro yakāraścottarāṅgam /*

105. *tasmāccottarā sparśe.*

Trans : The consonant, which comes even after the one, that appears by Krama (i.e. by way of doubling) belongs to the preceding vowel, provided it is followed by a sparśa.

106. *avasitam ca.*

Trans : The consonant, which stands at the pause, also belongs to the preceding vowel.

Note : The rules 99-106 correspond to the *Ath. Pr.* I, 55-58 :

parasya svarasya vyañjanāni / saṃyogādi pūrvasya / padyaṃ (i.e. padāntyaṃ ca repha-hakāra-kramajaṃ ca /

107. *vyañjanā svareṇa sasvaram.*

Trans : The consonants belonging to a vowel take the accent of the latter.

108. *uccairudāttaḥ.*

Trans : The tone, which is loud, is udātta.

109. *nīcāiranudāttaḥ.*

Trans : The tone, which is low, is anudātta.

Note : The sūtras 108-109 correspond to *Pāṇini* I.2.29, 30.

110. *ubhayavāntsvariṭaḥ.* Weber : *ubhayavān*

Trans : Svarita possesses the features of both.

Note : cf. *Ath. Pr.* I, 15

“*samānayame’kṣaramuccairudāttaṃ, nīcāiranudāttaṃ, ākṣiptam svaritam.*” According to this view svarita is a drawled sound, which is calculated to contain the features of both udātta and anudātta.

111. *ekapade nīcapūrvāḥ sayavo jātyaḥ.*

Trans : The accent of a syllable (an original svarita) is called jātya, when it is preceded by an anudātta in the same word and contains the consonant y or v.

Note : The *Taitt. Pr.* calls it nitya (XX.3) :

sayakāravakāraṃ tvakṣaraṃ yatra svaryate sthite pade’nudāttaṃ pūrve’pūrve vā nitya ityeva jānīyāt.

Trans : But where a syllable containing a y or v is circumflexed in a fixed word, being preceded (59) by a grave syllable, or not preceded by anything, that is to be known as nitya (Whitney).

Ath. Pr. III, 57 *anudāttaṃ pūrvāt saṃyogāt yavāntāt svaritam param apūrvam vā jātyaḥ. /*

112. *udāttaḥ dayāḥ pare sapta.*

Trans : There appear the following seven with udātta at the head.

113. *trayo nīcasvaraparāḥ.*

Trans : Of these the three have a low tone after them (i.e. these are primary and the rest are secondary).

Note : These are abhinihita, kṣaipra, and praśliṣṭa.

114. *edodbhyāmākāro lugabhinihitaḥ.* Weber : *nihataḥ*

Trans : When the anudātta a is elided by being juxtaposed after the udātta e or o the accent of the former (which is svarita by such arrangement) is known as abhinihita.

Note : The *Ath. Pr.* (III, 55) speaks the same thing *ekāraukārau padāntau parato’kāraṃ (padādi anudāttaṃ) so’bhinihitaḥ.*

Trans : When the anudātta a at the beginning of a word becomes suppressed by being united with the preceding e, o at the final position of a word it is known as abhinihita. The *Taitt. Pr.* calls it abhinihata as it states : *tasmādakāralope’bhinihataḥ* (X.5). Here Weber gives the following note : “*lub (oder lug) steht also hier für luptaḥ. Die construction ist ebenso elliptisch, wie in 8. Findet in diesem Ausdruck bereits*

eine Ubereinstimmung mit Pāṇini statt, so ist dies noch mehr der Fall bei et und ot (s. Pāṇini I.1.70) für deren t sich oben in 36 ff gar keine Begründung findet : freilich ist Pāṇini's Gebrauch desselben doch auch noch etwas anders."

Trans : lub (or lug) stands here for luptaḥ. The construction is as much elliptical as noted in 8. So far as this expression is considered there occurs an agreement with Pāṇini, which is also the case with et or ot (see Pāṇini I.1.70) for whose t there is no explanation above in 36 ff : surely Pāṇini's use of the same was something different.

115. *yuvāṇau yavau kṣaipraḥ*.

Trans : When the udātta i or u becomes transformed into y or v (respectively) before an anudātta vowel it is known as kṣaipra.

Note : The *Tuitt. Pr.* states the same : *ivarṇokārayoryavakārabhāve kṣaipra udāttayoḥ* (XX.1).

Trans : When i, ī and u are converted into y or v, the accent is kṣaipra, if they were acute. (Whitney). cf. *Ath. Pr.* III, 58-61 *antaḥsthāpattāṇ udāttasyānudanāte kṣaipraḥ / antapade' pi pañcapadyām / ukārasya sarvatra / oṇyośca /*

116. *ivarṇa ubhayato hrasvaḥ praśliṣṭaḥ*.

Trans : When two i vowels, of which the preceding is udātta and the following is anudātta, coalesce, it is known as Praśliṣṭa.

Note : The *Taitt. Pr.* gives a different definition : *ūbhāve praśliṣṭaḥ* (XX.6).

Trans : When two u vowels—one udātta and the other anudātta, coalesce the svarita is known as praśliṣṭa.

117. *svaro vyañjanayutastairovyañjanah*.

Trans : When a vowel comes after an udātta and is combined with it through consonants (one and more) it (though possessing a secondary svarita accent) is known as tairovyañjana.

Note : cf. *Ath. Pr.* III, 62 *vyañjnavyavetastairovyañjanah /*

118. *udavagrahastairovirāmah*.

Trans : When the udātta of a syllable stands in avagraha it is known as tairovirāma.

Note : It is missing in the *Ath. Pr.* The *Taitt. Pr.* uses the term prātihata (XX-3 ff) : *apicennānāpadasthamatha cet sā'hitena svaryate, sa prātihataḥ tasmādakāra lope'bhinihata ubhāve praśliṣṭaḥ / padavivṛtṭyām pādavṛttaḥ / udātta-pūrvastairovyañjanah /*

Trans : If moreover there is an acute standing in another word, then, if there be a circumflex resulting from a rule of combination, it is prātihata. After such a one, in case of the loss of an a, it is abhinihata. Where an ū results it is praśliṣṭa. Where there is a hiatus between two words it is pādavṛtta. Where an acute precedes it is tairovyañjana. (Whitney).

119. *vivṛttilakṣaṇah pādavṛttaḥ*.

Trans : It is called pādavṛtta, when it is separated from the preceding udātta by a hiatus.

Note : cf. *Ath. Pr.* III, 63 *vivṛtttau pādavṛttaḥ*, The same view has been expressed in the *Taitt. Pr.* as the above note indicates.

120. *udādyanto nyavagrahastāthābhāvyaḥ.*

Trans : The falling vowel at the end of the pūrvapada, which both precedes and follows an udātta, is known as tātābhāvya.

Note : Here Uvaṭa clarifies the sūtra : *udātādirudātānto nīcāvagrahastāthābhāvyaṣaṃjñāḥ svarō bhavati / yathā tanu naptre iti tanu naptre / tanu napāditi tanunapāt /* According to the author the tātābhāvya should be considered as svarita and as such it should be marked so. But this view has been contradicted by the Mādhyandinas, who are not willing to offer the character of svarita to the tātābhāvya. The commentary clarifies the point as : *natviha mādhyandinānām svarita upalabhyate, udātānūdāttau pṛthagbhūtau upalabhyete / svaritaśca udātānūdāttau-kībhāve sati bhavati / na ca tādīha kiñcidupalabhyate /* As here both the udātta and the anudātta remain separate and there is no chance of their combining together there cannot be any proper svarita feature here. So according to the Mādhyandinas tātābhāvya is a separate tendency as a result of which the voice goes from down to further down. *Yato mādhyandinānām padakāle tātābhāvyaṣaṃjñakuḥ kampo bhavati / kampanam nāma nīcādapi nīcatvam /* But as stated earlier our author considers tātābhāvya as svarita and differs from the Mādhyandinas. In the *Taith. Pr.* it is stated (XIX. 1-2) : *svaritayormadhye yatra nīca sūdudāttau vyatārato vodātta svaritayoḥ sa vikramah pracayapūrvāśca kauṇḍinyasya /*

Trans : If an unaccented syllable stands between two svaritas or two udāttas or between svarita and udātta or udātta and svarita it is called vikrama. According to Kauṇḍinya the same happens even when a pracaya precedes. Similar is the statement of the *Ath. Pr.* III,65 *abhinihitaprā(k)śliṣṭajātyakṣaiprāṇāmudātta svaritodayānāmanumātrā nighāto vikampanam tat kavayo vadanti /*

Trans : If an udātta or a svarita follows any of the four afore-mentioned primary svaritas there happens the loss of accent to the extent of one fourth mātrā, which is preparatory to the existence of the following udātta or svarita ; the wise call it vikampana (a trembling of the voice for the reduction of the accent).

121. *hastena.*

Trans : The recitation of this accent is accompanied by the movement of the hand (which keeps time by this).

Note : The udātta is indicated by the raising of the hand and the anudātta by the lowering of the same. The expression nihan becomes explained by this ; it is not merely a figurative expression as the udātta itself.

122. *catvārastiryaksvaritāḥ.*

Trans : Four of the svaritas are indicated by the side-way movement of the hand.

Note : The commentator states that the svaritas like jātya, abhinihita, kṣaipra and praśliṣṭa are to be pronounced with the stretching of the hands sideways as one makes while dedicating gifts to the ancestors : *jātyābhinihatakṣaiprapraśliṣṭā ete catvāra stiryaghaṣṭam kṛtvā svaranīyāḥ, pīṭḍānavaddhaṣṭam kṛtvetyarthah*

123. *anudāttaṃ cet pūrvam tīryaṃ kṣāṇvasya.*

Weber pūrvam

Trans : If an anudātta precedes them (i.e. the four svaritas according to the view of Kāṇva the hand is to be moved side ways and then to be dropped simultaneously).

124. *ṛjunnihatya prañihanyate udātte.*

Weber *ṛjuṃ nihatya prañihanyanta udātte.*

Trans : If an udātta follows these four svaritas the hand is to be lowered down straight (as far as in the case of the anudātta) and then is to be placed further down.

Note : Ananta-bhaṭṭa speaks clearly here :

jātyādicatvāra udātte parabhūte sati hastam ṛjuṃ kṛtvā pradarśanīyāḥ ṛjutvam ca manuṣyadānavaddhastasya / Anantabhaṭṭa clarifies that the lowering down of the hand straightly happens when one makes some gifts to the people.

125. *ṛikṣṇo'bhinihitāḥ paramparam mṛdustvanyah.*

Trans : The abhinihita is the sharpest (so far as its pronunciation and the movement of the hand is concerned) but others (i.e. the kṣaipra and praśliṣṭa etc.) are gradually softer.

Note : Here it should be noted that the jātya and the kṣaipra svaritas are considered as identical by the commentator Uvaṭa. So he states :

*kṣaipre jātyāntarbhāvo draṣṭavyaḥ tathā cōktam :
sarvatikṣṇo'bhinihitāḥ praśliṣṭa stadanantaram
tato mṛdutarau svārau iātyakṣaiprāvubhau smṛtau /
tato mṛdutarāḥ svārastairovyañjana ucyate
pādavṛtto mṛdutama stvetat svāvalāvalam /*

Trans : The Jātya is included in the kṣaipra. So it is said : "abhinihita is the sharpest among all and then comes praśliṣṭa ; but jātya and kṣaipra are considered softer even than the latter (i.e. . . praśliṣṭa) ; the accent tairovyāñjana is stated to be still softer. Pādavṛtta is the softest among all and this is the account of the respective strength of the accents". One finds in the *Taitt. Pr.* (XX. 10 ff) :

kṣaipranityayordṛḍhatarāḥ abhinihite ca / praśliṣṭaprātihatayormṛdutarāḥ / tairovyāñjana-pādavṛttayoralpatarāḥ /

Trans : In the kṣaipra and nitya the effort is firmer. As also in the abhinihita In the praśliṣṭa and prātihata it is gentler. In the tairovyāñjana and pādavṛtta it is feeble (Whilney).

126. *tasyādity udātta svarārdhamātram.*

Trans : The first half of the svarita vowel is udātta, (the other half is evidently anudātta).

Note : Though svarita is the combination of the udātta and anudātta it is still a separate kind of accent as the combination of two metals produces a separate kind of metallic substance. The *Ath. Pr.* (I. 16) states : *svaritasyādito mātṛārdhamudāttam.* Here *mātṛārdham* is not to be considered as identical with *svarārdhamātram.* cf. *Ṛk Pr.* Paṭ. II 2-3.

127. *sapta.* Weber *sapta sāmasu.*

Trans : In the sāman one uses the seven svaras (namely ṣaḍja, ṛṣabha, gāndhāra, madhyama, pañcama, dhaivata and niṣāda).

Note : The question is what necessity there is of the reference to *sāman* while the characteristic features of *yajus* are being discussed. But the objection is met by replying that in the *agnicayana* the *adhvaryu* has got certain function with the chanting of the *sāman* hymns. But others understand by seven *svaras* the different *svaritas* barring the *tāthābhāvya*. *apare tvāhuḥ jātyābhinihitakṣaiprapraśliṣṭatairovyañjanatairovir-āmapādavṛttāḥ sapta svarāḥ atrāvadhāryante / tāthābhāvyaḥ vājasaneyināṃ nivāryate /* Weber remarks here : “offenbar ist die erstere Erklärung vorzuziehen, resp. aber sind, etwa nach Anleitung von *śikṣā* V.14* die sieben Noten auf die siebenfachen Accent-modificationen zu beziehen, die bei der Recitation der *Sāman* verwendet werden. Um die siebenfache Bezeichnung derselben also an die Accentschreibung zu denken, wie Roth a.a. O page LXIX—LXX thut, hatte ich weder hier noch für das Folgende für nothwendig.”

Trans : Evidently the first explanation is to be referred—or probably according to the *śikṣā* V.14 the names of the seven notes refer to the sevenfold modifications of accent—which are used at the recitation of *sāman*. To think of the seven-fold indication of the same in the ms.—thus of the mode of writing the accent, as Roth has done in a.a. O page LXIX, LXX, does not appear necessary either here or in the following :
128. *trīn*.

Trans : But there are three *svaras* only (in the *yajurveda*).

Note : These are the *udātta*, *anudātta* and *svarita*.

129. *dvau*.

Trans : Two (in the *Brāhmaṇas*).

130. *ekam*.

Trans : There is only one *svara* in the sacrifice (which is called *ekāśruti* or *Tāna*).

131. *sāmājapannyūḥkhavarjam*.

Weber *sāmājapanyūṅkhavarjam*.

Trans : Excepting those prayers, which are sung, whispered and expanded (that retain their own accent).

132. *prāvucano vā yajuṣi*.

Trans : During the performance of the sacrifices also in the proper *yajus* passages instead of the *tāna* the *Samhitā* accent can be used.

Note : *pravacanaśabdena āṛṣapāṭhaḥ ucyate / tatra bhavaḥ svarāḥ prāvucanaḥ, sa ca traisvarya-lakṣaṇa eveti /*

133. *tamiti vikārah*.

Trans : If a word is used in the indicative it indicates the relevant transformation (to which the word in the nominative becomes subject).

134. *tasminniti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya*.

Trans : If a term be in the locative, the modification is intended for that word, which precedes the word in the locative.

135. *tasmādityuttarasyādeḥ*.

Trans : If a term be in the ablative, the modification is meant for the beginning of the following word.

Note : This rule (with the exception of ādeḥ) and the preceding one occur verbatim in *Pāṇini* (I. 1. 66-67)

136. *ṣaṣṭhī sthāneyogā.*

Trans : The genitive stands in connection with that, in whose place something else is to be substituted (i.e. a word is put in the genitive, for which something is to be substituted).

Note : This rule also is found verbatim in *Pāṇini* (I. 1. 49).

137. *tenetyāgamaḥ.*

Trans : The instrumental serves as an indication for some euphonic addition.

138. *antareṇa parvaṇi.*

Trans : The euphonic addition appears between two words.

Note : The word parva indicates pada, The āgama comes between two padas.

139. *paraḥ ekasmāt.*

Trans : The euphonic addition comes after the word, if it is to come after a single one.

140. *ubhayorvikārah.*

Trans : The modification may take place in both the words (in the final sound of the former and in initial sound of the latter sandhi).

141. *varṇasyādarśanam lopah.*

Trans : Lopa is called the disappearance of a sound.

Note : The above sūtra with the portion *varṇasya* omitted occurs in *Pāṇini* (I.1.60). In the *Taitt. Pr.* occurs (I.58) : *vināśo lopah.*

142. *vikāri yathāsannam.*

Trans : A sound undergoing modification passes over to the immediately following.

143. *saṅkhyātānāmanūddeśo yathāsaṅkhyam.*

Weber..... *anudeśo*

Trans : A subsequent reference to the formerly quoted words (or sounds) is in the order of corresponding numbers (i.e. the first word corresponds to the first, the second word to the second etc)

Note : cf. *Pāṇini* : *yathāsaṅkhyamanudēśaḥ samānām* (I.3.10). Uvaṭa states : *samāna-saṅkhyānām yaḥ paścāduddeśaḥ sa yathāsaṅkhyam bhavati.*

144. *sannikṛṣṭaviprakṛṣṭayoḥ sannikṛṣṭasya.*

Trans : When a rule becomes applicable simultaneously to a word in the distance as also to one of the proximity, it would be restricted to the latter.

Note : Uvaṭa suggests that this rule should be applied when there is a confusion regarding the application of a rule. He states : *yatrodāharaṇasamśayaḥ tatreyam paribhāṣā ucyate sannikṛṣṭa—viprakṛṣṭayorudāharaṇayoḥ sannikṛṣṭasyevodāharaṇasya kāryyam pratyetyam na tū viprakṛṣṭasya |*

145. *pūrvottarayoruttarasya.*

Trans : If a statement can be valid both with regard to the preceding and the following words it is to be restricted to the latter.

146. *dviruktamāmreḍitaṃ padam.*

Trans : A repeated word is called *āmreḍita*.

Note : Examples of this use are ;

nuścāmreḍite (IV,8), *āmreḍite cottarah* (VI.3). Pāṇini VIII.1.2. considers the second word of the repetition as *āmreḍita*.

147. *saṁhita sthitopasthitam.*

Trans : A word is called *sthitopasthita*, when it is separated in the *padapāṭha* by the word *iti* and the beginning and the end of this word *iti* undergo euphonic combinations with the neighbouring sounds.

Note : The following definition occurs in the *Ṛk Pr.* (Paṭ X.9) :

upasthitam setikaraṇam kevalam tu padam sthitam !

tatsthitopasthitam nāma yatrobhe āha saṁhite !

Trans : A word possessing *iti* is called *upasthita*, but one without it is stated to be *sthita*. A combination of both goes by the designation *sthitopasthita*.

148. *saṁhitāvadavagrahaḥ svaravidhau.*

param ca sarvaṃ cedanudāttaṃ.

Trans : So far as the accent is concerned the first member of the word, which is separated by the *avagraha*, retains the very accent, which it preserves in the *Samhitā* (i.e. in the state of non-separation in the *padapāṭha*) provided it is entirely *anudātta* : (otherwise it would be considered as a separate word and the syllables there preceding the *udātta* or *svarita* receive the *anudātta* accent not excluding the last, the *pracita*).

149. *itiparastiryañico'ntodātte madhyodātta parvaṇi kāṇvasys vā.*

Trans : According to the view of Kāṇva the accent of the *pūrvapada* following the word *iti* should be pronounced low, specially in case a word, which is *antodātta* or *madhyodātta*, follows.

150. *udāttamayo'nyatra nīca eva.*

Trans : Otherwise (—in case the above-referred does not follow) (according to the view of Kāṇva) the low accent following the word *iti* is like the *udātta* (i.e. *pracita*).

Note : Weber contradicts the statement, as in the last two examples after *iti* not the *nīca* but an *udātta* appears.

151. *ekavarṇaḥ padamaprṛktam.* Weber : *ekavarṇam*.....

Trans : A word consisting of one syllable is called *aprṛkta*.

Note : It occurs almost verbatim in the *Taitt. Pr.* (I.54,55) : *ekavarṇaḥ padam / so'prṛktasamjñah* / The vowels *a* and *u* appear as *aprṛkta* in the *Vāj. saṁhitā*.

152. *sa evādirantaśca.*

Trans : This alphabet (forming a word by itself) follows the rules, which are meant for the beginning and the end of a word.

Note : The same view has also been expressed in the *Taitt. Pr.* (I.56) : *ādyantavacca /* The commentary clarifies the *sūtra* in the words : *ekavarṇapadamādivacca antavacca bhavati*.

The euphonic combination of *indra ā ihi* to *indrehi* shows this clearly. Here with the preceeding a the vowel ā becomes changed to ẽ, but as such, with the following i it becomes changed to e.

153. *avagrahaḥ padāntavat.*

Trans. The separated first member of a compound follows the rules concerning alphabets, which are meant for the end of a word.

154. *na tvitīkaraṇam.*

Trans : But with the exception of the word, which stands as an independent vocable and is followed by iti (i.e. with the exception of the parigraha)

155. *pūrveṇottaraḥ s̐hitah.*

Trans : When the immediately following word is combined with the preceding (in sound and accent) it is called *samhitā*.

Note : In the *Taitt. Pr.* occurs : *nānāpadasandhānasamyogah padasamhitetyabhi-dhivate* (XXIV.3). *atha samhitāyām ekapraṇabhāve* (V.I). The commentary explains : *yāvadekocchvāsenocāryate tāvat samhitāvidhiḥ*. cf. *Pāṇini* : *paraḥ sannikarṣaḥ samhitā* (I 4.109).

156. *padavicchedo'sa hitah.*

Trans : The separation of individual words is called *asamihita*.

157. *ekapada-dvipada-tripada-catupadā-nekapadāḥ pādāḥ.*

Trans : In the verses the pada (quarter) consists of one, two, three, four or more words.

158. *varṇānāmekapraṇayogaḥ samhitā.*

Trans : In the non-metrical passages so many sounds are to be combined together as can be pronounced in one breath.

Note : cf. the comments under the sūtra 155.

159. *vipratīṣṭhe uttaram valavadalope.*

Trans : When two rules come in conflict regarding their application the later becomes applicable, provided there is no injunction regarding lopa (in which case the rule enjoining lopa should remain applicable even if it is earlier).

Note : This rule occurs also in *Pāṇini* (I.4.2).

160. *visarjanīyo' riphitaḥ.*

Trans : The visarjanīya standing after a and ā in the padapāṭha is called riphita (in the following cases but in the other cases it is called ariphita).

Note : All these riphitas are treated as sthitopasthita (parigraha) in the padapāṭha (see IV.18.192) provided they do not become changed to r in the *Samhitāpāṭha*. Another name for it is rit : see IV, 33 ; VI, 9.

161. *karamanudāttam. Weber karānudāttam.*

Trans : Kaḥ becomes a riphit, when it is anudātta (i.e. it appears as a verbal form and not as a pronominal one).

162. *antaranādyudāttam.*

Trans : Antar becomes a riphit when it is not ādyudātta.

163. *aharabhakāraparam.*

Trans : Ahaḥ becomes a riphit except when bh follows.

164. *āvarvariti samānarcī.*

Trans : Āvah and vaḥ are considered as riphits, when they occur in the same ṛc.

165. *stotarvastah sanuta-rabhārvārdvā.*

Trans : All these words are riphits.

166. *svaḥpadamanaraṇe.*

Trans : Svaḥ is riphit, when it is an independent word and is not followed by araṇa.

Note : The commentator gives the counter-example : *anaraṇe iti kim ? svāya cāraṇāya*. Here the following note has been supplied by Weber : “Dies Beispiel will aber wenig passen, ja da darin gar nicht mehr ein visarjaniya vorliegt : die Erklärung des comm, das es zur folgenden Regel ein parastādapavāda sei, hilft dem nicht ab. Es muss vielmehr offenbar dem Verf. vorliegende Text des *VS*. auch noch, wohl nach 17, 49, den vers *Ṛk* IV. 75. 19 *yo naḥ svo araṇo yaśca niṣṭyo jighāṃsati* enthalten haben, der sich jetzt nicht mehr darin findet. Oder sollte es etwa nur ein lapsus memorial des *Vf*s sein, so dass er jenem ihm aus dem *Ṛk* bekannten Vers irrtümlich auch der *VS* zugeteilt hatte”.

Trans : This example will suit very little, since there does not occur any visarjaniya here ; the explanation of the commentator that it would be ā parastādapavāda to the following rule, does not come to any help. Evidently the text of the *VS*, that remained before the author must have retained the *Ṛk* verse VI. 75. 19 *yo naḥ svo araṇo yaśca niṣṭyo jighāṃsati* according to 17, 49 but the same is not found there now. Or should it be probably a lapse of memory on the part of the author, so that he had attributed it to the verse of the *VS* after having taken it wrongly from the *Ṛk*.

167. *padādiścājīparah.*

Trans : The word svaḥ is riphita not only when it is an independent word but also when it stands at the beginning of a word without being followed by the voiceless stops.

168. *hvāḥ savitaḥ. punastvaṣṭarneṣṭarakarhetirmātaḥ prātarjāmātarajīgaḥ praṇetariti ca.*

Trans : The visarjaniya is riphita in all these words.

169. *vṛddham vṛddhiḥ.*

Trans : The text is highly important and prosperity follows them, who study this science.

CHAPTER II

1. svaritavarjamekodāttam padam. Trans : Every word possesses an udātta, excepting those which retain one svarita. Note : Here Uvaṭa suggests : *ekaṃ svaritaṃ prathamam varjayitvā ekodāttam padaṃ bhavati, sarvasinneva pade ekamakṣaram svaritam udāttam ca bhavati, anyānyakṣarāṇyannudāttānīti sūtrārthaḥ.*

2. anudāttam. Trans : The following are the anudāttas.

3. no nau me madarthe tridvyékeṣu. Trans ; The words naḥ, nau and me become anudāttas when they are used in the plural, dual and the singular respectively.

4. mā ca. Trans : The pronoun mā is also anudātta.

5. vo vānte tvadarthe. Trans : When the pronouns vaḥ, vām and te are used in the plural, dual and singular respectively they become the anudāttas.

6. tvā ca. Trans : So also tvā.

7. pūrvavānanudeśaḥ. Trans : A subsequent reference to a previously referred object (i.e. the pronoun, which serves this purpose) becomes anudātta.

8. asi. Trans : The word asi is anudātta.

9. yathā gr̥bhobhuvognibhyaḥ. Trans : The word yathā is anudātta, when it comes after gr̥bhaḥ, bhuvāḥ and agni.

10. girvaṇaḥ. Trans : The word girvaṇaḥ is anudātta.

11. agne ghṛteneti ca. Trans : Also the word ghṛtena is anudātta.

12. pracikitaśca. Trans : So the word cikitaḥ is anudātta, when it stands after pra.

13. eno'pāpe. Trans : The word ena is anudātta, when it does not indicate sin (pāpa) (but appears as a pronoun).

14. ihapūrvam śrutam. Trans : The word śrutam after iha is anudātta.

15. manye padapūrvam sarvatra. Trans : The word manye is anudātta in all the conditions, even if a word precedes it.

16. vācakamucit samasmād ghaha sma tvaīmmaryā aresvinnipātā ścet. Sharma.....
.....samasmāt..... Trans : The words vā, ca, kam, u, cit, samasmāt, gha, ha, sma, tva, īmmaryāḥ, are, svit—are all anudāttas, when they are nipātas. Note : Weber has made the following observation on the sūtra : “Weshalb letzeres Wort unter die nipāta, nicht als vocativ gerechnet wird (wie z. B auch 29, 37), ist mir noch immer so unklar, wie zur zeit des Vājas. S. spec. sec. p. 102. Es ist mir einmal in den Sinn gekommen, maryāḥ für aus smaryāḥ (precat. 2. p. sgl. von smar) verstummelt zu halten, und darin eine Art Interjection ‘memento’ zu suchen. Indes mir dies doch etwas zu gekunstelt ! Sollte aber etwa auch der Verfasser dgl. darin gesucht, und das Wort deshalb unter die nipāta gesetzt ? Oder sollte dies letzere nicht vielmehr ganz einfach zu den bei 8 aufgezählten Fallen, wo der Verf. des Prātiśākhya, domitare videtur zu rechnen sein ? ” Trans : It is still obscure to me as at the time of the Vaj. s. spec. sec page 102, why the last word is considered as one among the nipātas and not as a vocative (e.g. also 29.37). It occurred to me once that maryāḥ was to be taken as being mutilated from smaryāḥ (precat-

tive 2.p. sg. from the root *smar*) and here one is to interpret it as a kind of interjection 'memento'. Meanwhile it appears to me to be something very artificial. Did the author like to find the same (i.e. the *niapāta*) in the word and arrange it among the *nipātas* ? Or should the latter not be assumed as one of the instances, enumerated at 8, where the author of the *Prātiśākhya* is considered as *dormitare videtur*.

17. *padapūrvamāmantritamanānārthe'padādaū*. Trans : A vocative, preceded by a word, becomes *anudātta*, provided it does not begin another sentence or a new *pada*. Note : Here the commentary of Ananta-bhaṭṭa suggests : *atra anānārthatvaṃ nāma vākya-syādāveva vidyamānatvaṃ vivakṣitamarthāntarābhāvāt*. Trans : Here the expression '*anānārtha*' indicates that it should stand at the beginning. This seems to be the only meaning as no other meaning is possible.

18. *tenāntarā śaṣṭhyekapadavat*. Trans : A genitive, which immediately precedes or follows a vocative, is considered as one expression along with it (and either it is assumed as *anudātta* according to 17 or the first word of both becomes *ādyudātta*).

19. *napṛthividevayajanyośadhyā devabhūveḥ pavitrapate pavitrapūtasyāpānnapānṇpate somāgne somendrasya somasuvīryasya soma-viśveṣām devānām prajāpate yasya yasya devāgne tavāgne vājasyagne varuṇasyāpo asmākam*. Trans : In the instances, enumerated above, there is no inner connection between the vocative and the genitive so that both might be considered as one word. The genitive, therefore, preserves its own account. Note : Here Weber has made the following observation : "Es ist dies eine theils an und für sich sehr überflüssige, theils natürlich ganz unvollständige Aufzählung, in der sich sogar ein direkter Fehler zu finden scheint. Der Verfasser des *Prātiśākhya* hatte besser gethan, in 19 den *tenāntarā* noch eine nähere Bestimmung hinzu zu fügen über die Art der Verbindung des Genitiv mit dem Vocativ. cf. *Pāṇini* II. 1.2. wo eben aus 1 das *samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ* zur Geltung kommt." Trans : It is partly a by-itself very superfluous and partly a totally incomplete enumeration, in which even a direct mistake can be found. The author of the *Prātiśākhya* would have done better had he added to *tenāntarā* in 19 a more detailed condition on the nature of combination of the genitive with the vocative. cf. *Pāṇini* II. 1.2. where even from 1 the influence of *samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ* has remained operative.

20. *sumāṅgala-satyaṛājan-vikīridra-vilohita-daridra nīllohita-śreyaskara-bhūyas-karāmbembike'mbālike-śakhye-brahma-saṃśīte-maruto-aśvinā-yavye-gavye-dyāvā-pṛthivī-uro'g-nā 3i-patkni-vaṃllāji 3 cchāji 3-mīdhuṣṭama śivatama-sahasrākṣa-śateṣudhe-vasupate-vasudāvan*. Weber *śaravye* (for *śakhye*), *brahmasaṃśīte* (for *saṃśīte*), *patnīvan* (for *patknivam*) *lājin* (for *llāji 3*) *chācī* (for *cchāji*), *mīdhuṣṭama* (for *mīdhuṣṭama*). Trans : All these vocatives retain their own accent (and do not become *anudāttas* as indicated in *sūtra* 17).

Note : Here Weber has made the following comment : Auch diese ganze Aufzählung wurde ebenso wie die 21 folgende, ganz überflüssig sein, wenn der Verfasser es verstanden hatte, auf 17 eine Regel wie die bei *Pāṇini* VIII. 1.72 stehende folgen zu lassen. Der Hereinziehen übrigens von *yavye gavye* wie von *lāji3n chācī3n* in die Reihe der vocative—(s. auch 50) ist von grossen Interesse für unsere Interpretation dieser schwierigen Formen. Die traditional Erklärung weiss nichts mehr von dieser Auffassung." Trans : Also the entire enumeration so also that following in 21 would have been unnecessary if to the rule

17 the author could have understood to add a rule like one, which occurs in *Pāṇini* VIII. 1.72. Besides the inclusion of yavye gavye as also of alāji3n chāji3n into the series of vocatives (see also 50) is of great interest for the interpretation of these difficult forms. The traditional explanation knows nothing more of this interpretation.

21. iḍottarāṇi nava svānottarāṇi saḍagnyuttarāṇi catvāri bhagottarāṇi cendrottarameka sinivālyuttarām ca prajāpataye brahmanniti ca. Sharma cendrottaramekaṃ.....
Trans : The nine vocatives, which follow iḍā, the six vocatives which follow svāna, the four after Agni and Bhaga, each one after Indra and Sinivālī, so also the vocative Brahman after Prajāpataye retain their (ādyudātta accent) and do not become anudāttas as indicated in sūtra 17).

22. bhūtirādyudāttam. Trans : The word bhūti is ādyudātta.

23. kadā nariṣyemapūrvam. Trans : So the word kadā is ādyudātta when nariṣyema precedes it.

24. āmantritam ca. Trans : The vocative is always ādyudātta (since it is generally accented).

25. kṛṣṇo mṛgasayoge. Weber.....samyoge. Trans : The word kṛṣṇa is ādyudātta (when it is not an adjective but a substantive) and indicates a mṛga.

26. vyayavāmścāntaḥ. Trans : So the word antaḥ is ādyudātta when it is declinable. Note : Weber gives the following comments upon the sūtra : Der unterschied der hier zwischen dem avyayam antaḥ (Thema antar) und dem vyayavān antaḥ (Thema anta) für nothig erachtet wird (s auch I, 162) ist eigentlich ganz überflüssig, da ihre Themata sie ja schon Genüge scheiden. Denn wenn es sich auch hier, wie im Folgenden, allerdings überall zunächst nur um dem aussern Gleichklang der aufgeführten Formen selbst (s. auch I.161.166) handelt, so gilt doch unsere Regel, wie Z.B auch die folgende, nicht bloss für den Nomin. Sing (Masc.) bei welchem dieser in der That stattfindet, sondern zugleich auch für die ganze Deklination (resp. in 27 auch für alle genera). Es lässt sich dem zwar entgegen halten dass dies allerdings geschieht, aber nicht mit Absicht, insofern die eigentliche Absicht des Verfs nur dahin gehe die Accentverschiedenheit der im Padapāṭha oder sonst wirklich gleichklingenden Formen darzuthun. Trans : The difference, which is considered necessary between avyaya antaḥ (theme anta), and the vyayavān antaḥ (theme anta) is in fact absolutely superfluous, since there is sufficient difference in their forms. Because, though here, as also in the following cases, the outward similarity of the quoted forms has been treated, our rules and also the following do not concern only the nom. sing, where this actually occurs, but also the entire declension-system (resp. in 27 also for all the genders). It leaves itself to contradiction that this surely happens without any purpose, since the real purpose of the author is to show the difference of accent of words in the Padapāṭha or of words, which are similarly sounding.

27. paraḥ pradhāne. Trans : So paraḥ is such (i.e. ādyudātta), when it is used in the sense of supremeness (i.e. as an adjective).

28. mātṛā parimāṇe. Trans : So is also the word mātṛā (ādyudātta) when it indicates the sense of measure (and does not stand as the form of the instrumental sing. of the stem mātṛ).

29. dakṣiṇā ca. Trans : So is also the word dakṣiṇā (ādyudātta). Note : In Uvaṭa there occurs the illustration of dakṣiṇā as such in the sentence “tasya dakṣiṇā apsarastavānāma”. Weber points out that this line is likely to create difficulties, since in the Pada text instead of dakṣiṇā the word dakṣiṇāḥ should be read. The form in the sūtra represents dakṣiṇā as adverb, and not as a feminine stem in the different cases. There does not occur any other example in VS, which shows the occurrence of dakṣiṇā as an adverb maintaining the ādyudātta. The substantive dakṣiṇā is very frequent, so is also frequent dakṣiṇā diś and so also dakṣiṇā without diś.

30. na daśa viśvakarma niṣadyendrasya pātu sadaḥ sadbheṣu. Sharma..... viśśvakarmā.....niṣadyendrasya..... Weber.....sadbheṣu (for sadbheṣu). Trans : But the word dakṣiṇā would not be ādyudātta if it be followed by the word daśa, viśvakarman, niṣadya, indrasya, pātu, sadaḥ and sadbhyah. Note : The following examples have been provided by Uvaṭa : daśa dakṣiṇā deśa pratiḥ ayam dakṣiṇā viśvakarmā ācyā jānu dakṣiṇato niṣadya putravatī dakṣiṇata indrasyādhīpatye manojavāstvā pitṛbhiḥ dakṣiṇataḥ pātu yamanetrā dakṣiṇāsadaḥ yamanetrebhyo devebhyo dakṣiṇāsadbhyah. As Weber points out, the second example is suitable, since here the word dakṣiṇā is adverb and maintains the oxytone (i.e. accent in the final syllable), which is the case in the Śatapatha Br. and which also Pāṇini suggests. The first example causes one to assume that the text of the Padapāṭha reads dakṣiṇāḥ and not dakṣiṇā. For the text three examples, which possess dakṣiṇataḥ we should assume that the reading of the author was dakṣiṇā. The analogy will not, however, be applicable in the case of dakṣiṇāsadaḥ, as it a compounded word. The Śatapatha Br. gives the following accentuation : dākṣiṇā fem. sacrificial fee, dakṣiṇā diś, but dakṣiṇā adverb ; but an adjective shows the variation of its accent between ādyudātta and antodātta, sometimes dakṣiṇām bāhum and sometimes dākṣiṇām bāhum. It is interesting that the author did not speak about the masc. or neut. gender of the former. But the word dakṣiṇā both as neut. and masc. shows ādyudātta.

31. karnaḥ svāṅge. Weber karna..... Trans : The word karna is ādyudātta provided it indicates ear.

32. maho napuṃsake. Trans : The word mahas is ādyudātta when it is neuter.

33. śravaśca. Trans : So is also śravas (ādyudātta) when it is in the neuter.

34. andho vīrye. Trans : So is also andhas (ādyudātta) in the sense of power.

35. etā varṇe. Trans : The word etāḥ is ādyudātta when it signifies colour.

Note : The counter example, as the commentary supplies is etā me agna iṣṭakāḥ. Both the words, which occur in the example and the counter—examples are quite distinct—the first one is the nom. plur. masc. but the second one is fem. ; here the outward similarity of appearance has been taken into consideration—so also the difference of accent occurring there.

36. rohitaśca kevalaḥ. Trans : The word rohitaḥ too is ādyudātta provided it stands alone (i.e. it does not form a compound with any other terms). Note : Weber rightly points out that the counter example rohitkuṇḍavācī golattikā is absolutely unsuitable, since there is no rohita but rohit in the extract. The sūtra speaks of the accentuation in the rohita and not rohit.

37. yantrī rāṭ. Trans : The word yantrī is such (i.e. ādyudātta), when it is followed by the word rāṭ.

38. oṣadhīranāmantrite. Trans : The word oṣadhi is ādyudātta when it does not stand in the vocative. Note : Weber points out that the portion anāmantrite of the sūtra is superfluous, since the word oṣadhi in the vocative case does not occur in the Vāj. Saṃhitā.

39. sarvaviśvamānuṣāśāḥ svāhā vājaḥ payo namaḥ. Trans : The words sarva, viśva, mānuṣa, āśā, svāhā, vāja, payas and namaḥ are ādyudāttas. Trans : Weber points out that barring āśā and mānuṣa the account of other words varies in texts other than the VS. The other words are all ādyudāttas both in the VS and other texts. But as regards āśā it is stated by Śāntanācāryya that it is ādyudātta only in the sense of 'quarters of the heaven', in other sense the accent would be different ; but, in fact in the VS only the above meaning is found. The accent of mānuṣa varies in the Śatapatha-Br ; it is ādyudātta there also in those passages, which are quoted from the VS, but otherwise it is oxytone, i.e. accent remains in the last syllable.

In the compound the words sarva and viśva maintain the accent in the final syllable and this has been as less noted by the author, as those cases where the word sarva goes without any accent whatsoever. Weber suggests here that sarvataḥ ought to have been the reading in agreement with dakṣiṇataḥ of sūtra 30. Weber opines that the line is a half verse and the same originally stood as a marginal gloss, which later entered into the text.

40. asi śivā suṣadā payasvatī yattee madhumatīrvarcasvānojiṣṭho bhrājiṣṭhaḥ śuṣmīṇī bhadravācyāya vandyo medhyo yamādityastritaḥ somena svasetyeteṣu. Trans : The verbal form asi is ādyudātta when it is followed by śivā, suṣadā, payasvatī, yattee, madhumatīr, varcasvān, ojiṣṭha, bhrājiṣṭha, suṣmīṇī, bhadravācyāya, vandyo, medhya, yamāditya, trita, somena and svasā. Note : This enumeration is also superfluous according to Weber. He opines that a list can be prepared of other finite verbs, which are originally anudātta, but can become ādyudātta when followed by these words.

41. dhanadāratnadhābhyāṃ ca. Trans : The word asi is also ādyudātta when it comes after the word dhanadā and ratnadhā.

42. rāyo' poṣe. Trans : The word rāyas is ādyudātta when it is not followed by poṣa (i.e. when it is not genitive).

43. bhāgamiśiṣayoḥ. Trans : ' The word rāyas is not ādyudātta when it is followed by bhāga and iśiṣe. Note : Weber points out that the above restriction regarding the use of rāyas as ādyudātta is not comprehensive, because there are other words which

prohibit rāyas from being ādyudātta. He further believes that the rules 42 and 43 could have been combined together as rāyo'saṣṭhī for the sake of brevity.

44. tridhā vaddhahitayoḥ. Trans : The word tridhā is ādyudātta when it is followed by baddha and hita.

45. sukṛtambhūte. Trans : The word sukṛta is ādyudātta when it refers to some being. Note : We have given the above translation in agreement with the commentary of Anantabhaṭṭa, who states : bhūta iti kim ? sūktam ca me sukṛtam ca me ayaṃ ca na prāṇivācakaḥ kiñca puṇyābhidhāyakaḥ. But Weber's translation differs. He translates : Such is sukṛta, when it refers to the past (i.e. it is a form of the Perf. past participle).

46. dvirudāttāni. Trans : Here follow the words, which possess two udāttas.

47. vṛhaspati rvaanaspatirnarāśaṃsastanūnaptre tanūnapānnaktośaśośāsānaktā-dyāvā-prthivīdyāvākṣāmā kratūdakṣābhyāmetavā anvetavā iti ca. Trans : There are two udāttas in the words bṛhaspatiḥ, vanaspatiḥ, narāśaṃsaḥ, tanūnaptre, tanūnapāt, naktośāsā, uśāsā-naktā, dyāvāprthivī, dyāvākṣāmā, kratūdakṣābhyām, etavai and anvetavai. Note : Here the commentary of Anantabhaṭṭa suggests : bṛhaspatirityādidvādaśapadāni dvirudāttāni syuḥ, aviśeṣāt sarvavibhaktyantāni ade vatādvandvārtho'yamārambhaḥ. Trans : The twelve words with bṛhaspati at the beginning possess two udāttas. Due to want of special reference to any form (i.e. its use in some restricted form) these may appear in any case. These are mentioned here with a view to including them within the group of words, that possess two udāttas, as they do not belong to the "devatā-dvandva" class of words.

48. devatā dvandvāni cānāmantritāni. Trans : The forms of the devatā-dvandva should have two udāttas in case they do not stand in the vocative (where they remain unaccented according to the sūtra 17 or they become ādyudātta by the strength of the sūtra 24). Note : Here Uvaṭa comments : ca śabdādadhastana-sūtravihitānyanāmantritāni dvirudāttāni bhavanti āmantritāni tvāmantritasvaram labhante. Here the implication of the word ca is that other words coming below would have two accents, when they are not in the vocative. If in the vocative they would assume the accent of the vocative terms. Weber points out that the word āmantritāni is superfluous, which becomes evident from itself. cf. Pāṇini. VI. 2. 141.

49. indrābṛhaspatibhyāminrābṛhaspatī iti trīṇi. Trans : There are udāttas in the words indrābṛhaspatibhyām and indrābṛhaspatī.

50. sarvamagnā 3i lāji 3ñchāci3niti trimātrāṇi ca. Trans : The entire word is udātta in agnā3i, lāji3n and śāci3n, the final syllable of each of which possesses three mātrās.

51. praṇavaśca. Trans : The word 03m is entirely udātta and contains three mātrās. Note : Weber opines that the commentary does not mention that it is trimātra ; but, in fact, the commentary, which is published from Madras, retains the expression trimātra. So Weber's statement is possibly based upon a faulty manuscript. Here the statements of the Taitt. Pr. are to be observed (XVIII 1-7 : okāram tu praṇava ek'erdhah-trīyamātram bruvate udāttānudāttasvaritānām kasmīciditi śaityāyṇaḥ dhṛtapracayaḥ

kaunḍinyasya madhyamena sa vākprayaḡaḡ svaritaḡ plākṣi-plākṣāyaḡayoh udātto vālmikeḡ yathāprayogaḡ vā sarveṣāḡ. Trans : As praṇava some utter o with two and a half moras. Śaityāyana says it is to be uttered with either one of acute, grave or circumflex. According to Kaunḍinya it is a sustained pracaya. That application of the voice is with middle tone. According to Plākṣi and Plākṣāyaṇa it is circumflexed. According to Vālmiki it is acute. All agree that it may also be according to application. (Whitney).

52. viveśā 3 iti cānudāttam. Trans : The word viveśā entirely is anudātta but the final syllable contains three mātrās.

53. āsī 3 diti cottaraḡmivāre. Trans : The word āsīt as the second member (in a disjunctive question) is entirely anudātta and the final syllable here contains three mātrās. Note : cf. Pāṇini-VIII. 2. 102., 97.

54. pūrvamantodāttam. Trans : As the first member in the enquiry the word āsīt is antodātta (and the final syllable likewise possesses three mātrās).

55. dvandvaḡ cendra somapūrvam pūṣāgnivāyuḡ. Weber.....
pūrvam..... Trans : A devatā-dvandva, whose first member is Indra and Soma and the second Pūṣan, Vāyu or Agni, does not possess the double-accent (according to sūtra 48) but is antodātta. Note : Uvaṭa explains the sūtra in the words : devatādvandvaḡ ca indrasoma pūrvam pūṣāgnivāyuḡ parabhūteṣvantodāttam bhavati dvirudāttāpavādaḡ indraḡ pūrvam yathā indrapuṣṇoh, indrāḡnoḡ.....indravāyubhyāḡsomapūrvasya yathāsambhavamudāharaṇam.

Weber opines that no example with Soma occurs in the VS or the Śat.Br. Only Somāpauṣṇa, a derivative of Somāpuṣaṇau occurs in 24. 1 (or Śat.Br. XIII. 2.2.6). In the Śat.Br. only once Somārudrau V. 3.2.2.3 (Saumāraudra V. 2.2.1) occurs and is also antodātta. This anomaly cannot be explained.

The devatā-dvandva words due to their changing accents have put the grammarians to a great difficulty. Pāṇini's injunction, that in case the second name begins with anudātta the compound should possess only one accent, sometimes does not prove true with regard to the forms in the VS, as it is evidenced by the compound agnindau, which possesses only one accent, though Indra begins with the udātta ; sometimes Pūṣan and Rudra are to be considered as exceptions in conformity with his rules.

56. agniścendre. Trans : When Agni is followed by Indra the compound has got the antodātta. Note : Anantabhaṭṭa explains the sūtra in the words : indrottaram agnipūrvam devatādvandvaḡ antodāttam syāt indraśabde pare. But according to Weber's assumption the wording of the sūtra suggests that the word Agni itself should be antodātta, when it is followed by Indra, which is obviously not the case. Because here the antodātta comes in the entire compounded form.

57. ṛksāmni ca. Trans : When ṛk is followed by sāman the compound is antodātta. Note : Like the preceding one the present sūtra too literally means that the word ṛk is antodātta, when sāman follows, which is obviously not the case.

58. yoto gatau. Trans : The word yataḥ (acc. to plur. of the present participle of the root i) is antodātta in the sense of going

59. pāyorviśaḥ. Trans : The word viśaḥ after pāyu is antodātta. Note : Here Weber states : Properly speaking the word viś should be oxytone throughout in the gen. sing. In fact this is the only case in a passage of the VS but in the second passage, which maintains the condition for that, the accent stands on the first syllable. The remaining oblique cases are regularly antodātta.

60. āyuvaryamorvaśyastibhyaḥ. Note : The word āyuḥ is antodātta when it is followed by aryamā, urvaśī and asti. Note : Here the following observation has been made by Weber : The form of the one is naturally āyu, while that of the other is āyus. Two forms, which the author has forgotten still, are āyuvāḥ (from the root yu) and āyāvāḥ. Both have got the same claim to be mentioned here, as āyoḥ proceeds from both. With respect to the skipping of the present kaṇḍikā-division, as it occurs in this last, I refer to my note on the sūtra 40. The expressions padasamhitodāharaṇam contain the explanation of the comm. for the fact that in the relevant passage āyuḥ follows not at all urvaśī but asi. He maintains it consequently as an extract, which the author produces from the padapāṭha, where the word asi is missing actually, which is necessary in all the like repetitions in the padapāṭha. See IV. 165 ff.

61. asya rocanāsau bodhā me pārapura etāro divaḥ kohantvammahīm ya īśa īśānebhyaḥ. Sharma.....ca (for ya)..... Trans : The word asya is antodātta (against rules 7 and 63) when it comes after rocanā, asau, bodhā, me pāraṃ, pura, etāraḥ, divaḥ, kaḥ, ahaṃ, tvam, mahīm, ya īśe and īśānam. Note : Sharma's reading ca for ya is surely a mistake. Weber points out that some of these, after which asya comes, might, have been used as substantives and some again as adjectives.

62. pratnām yajñasya haviṣaḥ pāhīpātām madhvo yajamānasya hoturajarāso lokeṣu ca. Trans : The word asya is antodātta also when it stands before pratnām, yajñasya, haviṣaḥ, pāhī, it, pātām, madhvo, yajamānasya, hotur, ajarāso and lokaḥ. Note : As pointed out before, here too some of these words are used as substantives but some again as adjectives.

63. anudāttamanyat. Trans : Asya in any other position is anudātta. Note : Weber remarks that this sūtra is absolutely unnecessary on the face of the sūtra 7.

64. paktīrhasayorantaḥ udāttam ādirvā. Weber.....udātta..... Trans : In the words paktiḥ and hasa one can put the udātta both in the initial or in the final syllable. Note : Weber remarks here : Paktis and hasa are treated as paroxytone (i. e. bearing the accent on the last but one syllable) in both the schools.

65. vṛddham vṛddhiḥ. Trans : This text is highly important and prosperity favours them, who study this science.

**INDIAN
STUDIES**
PAST & PRESENT

A Quarterly Journal

Editor : Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya

Mg. Editor : R. K. Mitra, 3, Sambhunath Pundit St., Calcutta-20

Annual Subscription Rs. 16/- [Postage Rs. 4/- extra] Subscription for abroad—£ 2/- [inclusive of Postage by surface mail]. 5th year begins from October, '63

BOARD-BOUND REPRINTS : LIBRARY EDITION

- Bühler, G. *Indian Paleography*. With Introductory essays by F. Max Müller & J. F. Fleet. Complete with portfolio of 9 plates and 8 transliteration tables. Rs. 25.00
- Beams, J. *Outlines of Indian Philology*. With introductory essays by G. A. Grierson and S. K. Chatterji. Complete with the Linguistic Map of India. Rs. 5.50
- Dalton, E. T. *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*. Verbatim reprint of the text with 40 plates
Rs. 35.00
- Barth, A. *Bulletin on the Religions of India*. Rs. 5.00
- Przyluski, J. *Ancient Peoples of the Punjab* Rs. 6.00
- De, S. K. *Bengal's Contribution to Sanskrit Literature and Studies in Bengal Vaiṣṇavism*.
Rs. 12.50
- Sanghvi, Sukhlalji. *Advanced Studies in Indian Logic and Metaphysics*. Rs. 12.50
- Mitra, R. L. *Antiquities of Orissa* Verbatim reprint of the text with plates.
Two Vols. 5. Rs. 35.00 Each
- Kaviraj, Gopinath. *History and Bibliography of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika Literature*.
Rs. 10.00
- Pemberton, R. B. *Report on Bootan*. Verbatim reprint with maps. Rs. 12.50
- Chakladar, H. C. *Aryan Occupation of Eastern India*. Edited with an introductory note
by N. K. Basu. Rs. 12.50
- Singh, Ganda. (ed.) *Early European Accounts of the Sikhs*. Rs. 12.50
- Firminger W. K. *Historical Introduction to the Bengal Portion of 'The Fifth Report'*.
Rs. 40.00
- Chakladar, H. *Geography of Kālidāsa*. Rs. 8.00

Postage extra.

Printed at Quality Printers & Binders, 84 Rash Behari Avenue, Calcutta-26, by Ramakrishna Maitra and
published by him from 3, Sambhunath Pandit Street, Calcutta-20.